THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

Canon J. E. Fison of Rochester Cathedral has published a lively and matterful book entitled *Fire Upon the Earth*.[1] Its theme is the Holy Spirit by whose presence and activity alone can we be pointed forward to a revival of genuine religion. In a previous book, published in 1950 with the title 'The Blessing of the Holy Spirit,' Canon Fison dealt with this theme in the light of the limitations manifest in liberal Protestantism and in evangelical Pietism and catholic Mysticism. The one is in danger of losing touch with the Supernatural, the others of disrespecting the natural. Only when the Spirit is given unhindered right of way can this arrested development be healed.

To this theme in a fresh and independent way Canon Fison returns in his new book. It is a slim volume (paper bound) of a hundred and thirteen pages, but much of the scholarly substance of the earlier book is here presented in popular, and as befits a book on the Spirit, in passionate form. It has the added interest that in most of the chapters the discussion is brought to bear in a lively way upon some of the trends and upheavals present in our contemporary cultural setting.

Two main questions are raised. First: How can the Spirit be given unhindered right of way in the individual and in the Christian community? Second: If this unhindered right of way be given, how can we be sure that he is the Holy Spirit and not another counterfeit? One way of dealing with both questions is to survey the Biblical evidence, and this is the way Canon Fison follows. There will be agreement with Canon Fison that this evidence 'provides most interesting and, indeed, exciting answers.'

In dealing with this Biblical evidence the ways of the working of the Spirit can be regarded in seven stages or facets though, as Canon Fison makes clear, such divisions in analysis are always somewhat arbitrary and abstract. In reality, in the midst of life they coexist and overlap. With this reminder Canon Fison draws out his distinctions in this order.

The Old Testament material from the Book of Judges to the Wisdom Literature shows (1) the working of the primitive Spirit, involving the unconscious and sub-conscious depths of life; (2) the challenge of the prophetic Spirit to man's conscious will, often amid strong community opposition; (3) parallel to this the appeal of the priestly Spirit to his emotions and feelings; and (4) the stimulus of the philosophical Spirit to his intellect. Increasingly the Spirit is finding its way into the whole life. Then in the New Testament we can mark (5) the pietist Spirit in the intimate circle of Friends (The Fire in the Heart); (6) the expanding range of the Pentecostal Spirit (The Missionary Fire); and (7) the unlimited scope of the Pauline Spirit personal and corporate (The Fire of Unity). To the seven chapters that present the exposition of this there is added one entitled 'The Fire of Love.' It answers the question how we can be sure of the Holy Spirit by pointing to the Johannine doctrine of the Paraclete.

It will be clear to the reader how necessary it is to keep in view the author's reminder of the limitations inherent in this form of analysis. Yet it allows Canon Fison to engage our minds in a most suggestive and rewarding way with the varied richness of Scripture. We will indicate some of the content of two chapters—ch. 2 'The Fire of the Word,' and ch. 8 'The Fire of Love.'

The great prophets of the Old Testament emphasize the Word of the Lord rather than His Spirit. Their sparing references to the Spirit can best be explained by their wish to dissociate themselves from the abnormalities of the 'Spirit-possessed.'

[1] Edinburgh House Press; 5s. net.

The Word in them is intelligible fire, controlled for constructive ends. But how can we further characterize this having or hearing the Word of God ? First, the Spirit speaks through the prophets not to utter generalized statements, but to direct attention to concrete situations. Second, a main form of the speaking was categorical protest against human arrogance, lust for power, injustice. Third, the prophet staked his all on an interpretation of a current event which means that he walked by faith and in so doing he ran the risk of being at some point and in some respects wrong. Fourth, this being of the essence of prophecy, the element of prediction in the prophets is set in proper perspective. Primarily it was not the future they regarded or tried to measure. The prophet made an ' existential ' judgment and demand upon the present. The future was with God but the present was theirs for well or ill and prophet and people were implicated in it up to the hilt. Finally, it is important to remember that though the great prophets speak from and to consciousness, and though they dissociate themselves from abnormalities they do not disown what is connoted by the term the primitive. In their awareness of God, too, the great depths, and the hidden reaches of their personalities were touched and tapped. They had their wits about them always, but undergirding their reflections was experience of being strangely grasped and uplifted ecstatically. Following upon this account Canon Fison puts the question, Can we see signs of this fire of the Word in our day ? And his answer is that we can, and that the forms of it are numerous. There are community movements, heroic ventures in leadership, and in reflective thought, thrustings outside conventional religion for human rights in which we ought to discern the Spirit seeking its right of way. Among the references here we note Luther King of Alabama, Michael Scott, George F. Macleod, the successor of Gandhi, Vinoba Bhave, the Abbé Pierre of Paris, Martin Buber.

In the New Testament part of his book Canon Fison offers a glowing chapter (7) on ' The Pauline Spirit.' In Paul's own experience so many different elements of the Spirit's work were combined that to him more than to any other we are indebted for the full Christian doctrine. He was not just an itinerant evangelist, but a builder of a new community across the barriers and divisions of the ancient world. But this carries with it a peril. How can we be sure that the Spirit thus radically and inclusively expressed is the Holy Spirit ? This is a real problem and that is why finally John's doctrine of the Paraclete is so important for everything in Christian faith and practice. Two vital points are set forth in the chapter dealing with this. First, the Spirit which is of God is always self-effacing, and, second, in the Christian dispensation its aim is always to make Christ luminous. Whatever glorifies Jesus that is the test and the safeguard of genuine religion. And this means that a religion of the Spirit will always be bringing us back to the Cross (where Love sought us and still finds us) and forward not into any mystic freedom, or secluded piety but into the real world of mutuality, of responsibility, of burden-bearing. The tie up between the Spirit and Jesus Christ is complete. Here, then, is the test, the ultimate criterion of the ' presence ' ; it is self-effacing love.

There is fire in Canon Fison's book. He writes boldly, sharply, and for him, too, the writing and the interpretation is walking by faith. So he will readily agree that in some of his applications of truth he may be wrong ! For even the great prophets were so at times. But he has set forth pungently a vital theme for which his readers will be grateful. We can best express it at the end by quoting his own words : ' We must observe the Biblical priorities : the Spirit is primary, the sacraments and scriptures are secondary ; the Spirit is in the Godhead, the sacraments and scripture are not.'

In this day of ' Biblical Theology ' it is often suggested that the assured results of Biblical criticism can now be taken for granted, and that scholars may turn to the task of apprehending and presenting afresh the authoritative message of the Bible as a whole. That needs some qualification. For one thing, such a book as *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, by Professor Edward J. Young,[1] is a sharp reminder that ' the assured results ' are not universally accepted, and that pre-critical assessments of the Bible still have their scholarly exponents. Perhaps it is one of the urgent tasks of our time to attempt a real conversation with such scholars. Is there something they have to say that others need to be reminded of ? Is it possible to modify their conviction that all criticism is a work of the Devil ?

In these lectures, Dr. Young presents himself as one of ' those who accept the Bible as trustworthy '. That could, of course, seem most provocative to those who believe that their critical conclusions have been borne in upon them by evidence which the Bible itself discloses, and who do not feel that the issues are fairly stated in terms of trustworthiness or untrustworthiness. It is, indeed, true that many Biblical critics have

[1] James Clarke ; 10s. 6d. net.

approached their studies with presuppositions which were not Biblical and Christian—Wellhausen himself, for example, with his concept of religious evolution, and others, apparently, with a conscious or unconscious disposition to rule out in advance the possibility of miracle, of predictive prophecy, of anything that could properly be described as 'special revelation'. But that cannot be said of all Biblical critics, and on the other hand it is at least questionable whether Dr. YOUNG's own starting-point is as Biblical as he supposes. He seems for a moment to be about to establish himself on very strong ground when he proposes to build on 'the Bible's own testimony to itself', but does the Bible anywhere assure us that 'in His providence God had prepared just those men whom He desired to be the penmen of His Word, and upon them He brought the superintendence of His Spirit, so that they wrote precisely what He wished to have written'? Or is that a presupposition inherited rather from Rabbinical sources? Is that how anybody would naturally describe the impression made on him by, say, the Psalms? Dr. YOUNG apparently regards it as an axiom for those who would approach the Bible from the standpoint of 'Christian theism'—but then it is also one of his axioms that 'everything that occurs takes place because God decreed it so'!

It sometimes appears as if, to Dr. YOUNG, the Book itself, or even the 'information' given by God in the Book, were itself the revelation. He will not hear of any suggestion that we should think of God's revelation as given in His acts in history and in the interpretation of them given by inspired men—unless that means that God Himself supplied and therefore guarantees every word of their interpretation. How, otherwise, he asks, can we be sure that their interpretation is true? Did not other nations of Old Testament times also believe that their gods had acted mightily in their history? (He does not note that men of other faiths have also claimed that God had given them an infallible book.)

Dr. YOUNG is no opponent of the concept of 'progressive revelation'; on the contrary, he insists on it; and he evinces an admirable familiarity with the work of many other scholars over a wide range. Some of his main theses would commend themselves to almost all Christian scholars, but he applies them in a manner that most would find unacceptable. (1) 'The religion of the Bible is a religion that is founded squarely upon certain things that God did in history'. Yes, indeed! But that leads on to an assertion of literal historicity, when he deals with the Eden story, to the exclusion of all talk of symbolism, myth or parable. (Yet his own interpretation, in time-honoured fashion, of Gn 3^{15} as a promise of the victory of Christ is allegorical enough.) (2) 'Because the Bible bears a formal similarity to other literatures of antiquity, we must not conclude that it derived its content entirely from these other literatures'. Surely every Christian scholar would accept that—but not as implying that the Bible is in every detail and in all respects inerrant. (3) '*In vetere novum latet, in novo vetus patet*'. That again is hardly likely to be disputed, but it cannot justify the over-ruling of the immediate contemporary meaning of Old Testament passages in order to find predictions of the coming of the Messiah.

But those who are earnestly concerned to hear for themselves, and to help others to hear, the Word of God as it is spoken through the Bible cannot be content with pointing out weaknesses and inconsistencies in this 'conservative' argument. Does the argument bear witness to some considerations that have been lost sight of? Dr. YOUNG does in effect remind us that the Bible is, for Christians, not merely a source-book for the study of notable religious experience, but the Book of our faith, and that we shall not rightly discern its message unless we approach it from the standpoint of faith. That is a pertinent reminder, but does it really imply that we must begin by regarding the Bible as an inerrant written revelation? 'Those who claim infallibility for either Church or Bible', says a recent writer (Richard Hanson, in *The Church of Rome: A Dissuasive*), 'have certain strange affinities. . . . To assume the existence of an infallible authority tends to destroy faith rather than to encourage it, because on this assumption faith is likely to become a preliminary act of belief in the authority, followed by a series of intellectual assents to the doctrines it propounds, instead of a life-time of continuous affirmation and confession'. That also is worth pondering.

Great Themes of the New Testament

I. Philippians ii. 1–11

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

Before beginning this series of expositions of great passages of the New Testament, I wish to set down the aim with which I have embarked upon it. A. B. Bruce, writing of this same passage with which we are to deal in this present article, said: 'The diversity of opinion prevailing among interpreters is enough to fill the student with despair, and to afflict him with intellectual paralysis' (*Humiliation of Christ*, 8). The trouble with full-size commentaries is that they frequently spend much time in two activities. They labour to set out every possible interpretation of the passage with which they are dealing, and they offer so many alternatives that at the end they leave the seeker more bewildered than when he began. And they spend much time and labour and erudition on justifying by many an argument, sometimes polemically, the view they themselves take. This is not to belittle the great commentaries; the information they supply is essential for all scholarly work. Even if one wished to, one who has spent the greater part of his working life studying them could not empty his mind of what he has learned from them, nor rid himself of the debt he owes to them. But, even so, I think that there is a place for a kind of exposition which is not concerned to state all the possible alternatives, and which is still less concerned with arguments to prove itself right and others in error, but which simply brings to a passage such equipment as it possesses, and sets down what it thinks that passage first meant, and what it now means. That is what in this series I wish to try to do; and I begin by turning our thoughts to a passage which is one of the highlights of the letters of Paul, to Ph 2^{1-11}.

When Paul wrote the Letter to the Philippians, he was in prison, most probably in Rome ($1^{13.\ 14.\ 16}$ 4^{22}). To no Church was Paul closer in heart and soul than to the Church at Philippi. He yearned for them as a lover for his loved one (1^{8}). They are in his heart (1^{7}). He was praying for them, and he knew that they were praying for him ($1^{3.\ 19}$). Nothing could delight them more than that he should be enabled to visit them again (1^{26}), and indeed he hoped that such a visit would soon be possible (2^{24}). They are his 'dearly beloved,' his 'joy and crown' (4^{1}).

And yet, as he writes, Paul is worried. It may be, he feels, that they will think that the imprisonment which has come to him is the end (1^{12-19}). He feels that they still need him and still need what he can give them and what he can do for them ($1^{24.\ 25}$), however much he would like to lay down his burden and to rest. They have to go through their own suffering for Christ (1^{28-30}). There are Jewish teachers who might well mislead them ($3^{18.\ 19}$). And there are always earthbound creatures, who are a discredit to the Church, and who are liable to forget that they are a colony of heaven upon earth (3^{18-20}). So Paul writes to them, and there are three reasons for his writing.

1. When the Philippians had sent their gift to Paul, they had sent Epaphroditus with it. They had intended that Epaphroditus should stay to serve Paul in prison, but he had fallen ill, and had come close to death. Perhaps Epaphroditus was home-sick; and certainly he was worried because he knew that the people in Philippi were worried about him. So Epaphroditus had to go home; and Paul writes him what is almost an affectionate testimonial. There were those in Philippi who might well regard Epaphroditus as a quitter, and Paul, with his perfect courtesy and consideration, writes about Epaphroditus in a way that will make it easy for him to go back (2^{25-30}). There is something very touching in the picture of Paul facing death, and yet concerned to see that Epaphroditus is not undervalued or misunderstood.

2. Philippians is a letter of thanks. The Philippians, as they had done before, had sent Paul a gift, and Paul writes to thank them for their kindly thought (4^{10-18}). The correspondence of Paul teaches us the courtesy which never forgets the letter of thanks.

3. But that which moved Paul to his most moving and eloquent appeal was the fact that there was danger of dissension within the Philippian Church. He beseeches them to stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel (1^{27}). He insists that all things must be done without murmurings and disputings (2^{14}). He knows well how it is a human tendency for people to seek their own and not the things of Christ (2^{21}). The Jewish invaders may well cause a split in the Church (3^{2}). Euodia and Syntyche are at variance, and it would not be the first time that a personal quarrel disrupted the whole structure of a Church (4^{2}). The trouble at Philippi had not yet reached serious proportions but Paul was wise to the truth that prevention is better than

cure, and that, as some one has put it, it is wiser to fence a dangerous road to keep people from falling over a precipice, than it is to keep an ambulance waiting at the bottom to clear up the wreckage after they have fallen over. So Paul in our passage brings every appeal to bear on the Philippians to live in unity together (2^{1-11}). How, then, does Paul make his appeal?

(1) He sets before the Philippians **the ideal of Christian unity** in a series of vivid phrases.

(*a*) He uses two very similar phrases. As the A.V. has it, he urges them to be 'like-minded' and to be 'of one mind.' In the first instance the Greek is *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*; in the second it is *τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν*. The word *φρονεῖν* is sometimes translated 'to think'; but the real characteristic of it is that it describes a man's whole attitude and disposition of mind. It does not describe one piece of thinking; it describes that attitude of mind which is behind all a man's thinking. *Τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονεῖν* is to have a flesh-dominated attitude of mind (Ro 8^{5}). *Ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν* is to be lofty-minded (Ro 2^{20}). *Τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονεῖν* is to have an earth-bound mind (Ph 3^{19}). *Τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖν* is to have a mind that is set on the things that are above, as *τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς φρονεῖν* is to have a mind that is interested in nothing but the things on this earth (Col 3^{2}). *Τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* is literally 'to think the same'; that is to say, it is to have a mind whose disposition is harmony. It is all too true that there are people whose disposition is to make disharmony; they are characteristically disposed to look for occasions through which argument and difference may be fomented; and it is equally and blessedly true that there are those whose characteristic disposition is harmony. Paul has no doubt in which the Spirit of Christ dwells. What is the difference between this phrase *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* and the very similar phrase *τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν*? *Τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν* is literally 'to think the one thing.' There is no general agreement amongst commentators as to where the difference lies, and there are, indeed, many who think that there is no discernible difference, or certainly no expressible difference. I suggest that the difference may well be this. *Τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* describes the general disposition of harmony which should be the background against which the whole Christian fellowship moves, and the atmosphere in which the life of the Christian fellowship is lived. *Τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν* describes the atmosphere when that all pervading atmosphere of harmony is brought to bear on one particular issue and one particular decision. To Paul the Christian ideal is a disposition to harmony in all things, and a situation in which that Christian harmony is the deciding influence in any time of decision in thought or in action.

(*b*) Paul pleads with the Philippians to have the same love. The word for love is *ἀγάπη*. Herein lies the essence of the Christian ethic. Greek possesses four words for 'love.' There is *ἔρως*, which is the love of passion, and in which there is always sex. So nearly does that word become 'lust' that it never occurs in the New Testament at all. There is *στοργή* which is the word for family love, the love of parent for child, and child for parent. There is *φιλία* which is warm, affectionate love, including both spiritual and physical fellowship and intimacy. And there is *ἀγάπη*, which is hardly a word of classical and secular Greek at all. It is a word, as R. C. Trench says, 'born within the bosom of revealed religion.' What is its essential flavour? Its essential flavour is to be found in Jesus' words in Mt 5^{43-48}. There Christians are bidden to love even their enemies. Why? Because such a love is like the love of God. What, then, is the great characteristic of the love of God? God makes His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust (Mt 5^{45}). That is to say, there is in God an unconquerable benevolence. Let a man be the friend of God or the enemy of God, God's benevolence extends to him. The essential fact about this Christian *ἀγάπη* is that it is the exercise of a man's total personality. Love in the ordinary sense of the term, is an emotional experience. We love because we cannot help it. As it has been said, we admire people for reasons, we love people without reason. Liking is an inexplicable thing; it happens with no effort of our own. But *ἀγάπη* is not only a thing of the heart; it is also a thing of the will. It is not a mere happening; it is a conquest. It is something into which we must will ourselves, and can only will ourselves through the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Further, this is a new thing. Plutarch's definition of a real man was that he was a man who was useful to his friends and dangerous to his enemies. The demand of Christianity is a universal and unconquerable benevolence to all people, no matter what their attitude to us, and their treatment of us is. Paul's injunction is that the Philippians should 'have the same love.' That is to say, that in the heart of each and all of them there should be this benevolence which nothing could ever sour. It is easy to see what unity such love could bring into any Church.

(*c*) Paul urges the Philippians, as the A.V. has it, to be 'of one accord' The Greek is *σύμψυχοι* which is a vivid word. The *συμ* part of the word means 'together'; and the *ψυχοι* part is from *ψυχή*. What, then is the *ψυχή*? The word *ψυχή* occurs thirteen times in Paul's Epistles. Once in 1 Th 5^{23} we get together the three parts of man—body, soul, and spirit. The soul is the *ψυχή*. But here we must have a care. The body is the

physical part of man. The spirit is that part of man which makes him able to reason and to think, and which makes him kin to God; it is through his spirit that man can receive a message from God, and can enter into fellowship with God who is spirit. But in Greek psychology the *ψυχή*, the soul, is the principle of physical life. Spirit (*πνεῦμα*) is peculiar to man; he alone possesses it. But he shares *ψυχή* with everything that has life. An animal has *ψυχή*; even a plant, insofar as it is a living organism, has *ψυχή*; for *ψυχή* is the life principle of everything that lives and breathes. With the exception of Eph 6^{6} and Col 3^{23}, where *ψυχή* approximates much more to the English sense of 'heart,' in the meaning of the seat of the emotions and the desires, *ψυχή* in Paul is the essential life principle. So, then, when Paul says that Christians must be *σύμψυχοι* he means that they must share the same life principle. They must be so united that they actually share the same life; and that becomes possible because the common life of the Christian is Christ. The unity of Christians is such that they share the one life principle; they are one in that essential life by which men live.

(*d*) Paul then goes on to tell of the things which must be eradicated. Nothing must be done 'through strife.' The word for strife is *ἐριθεία*. It is a word with a strange history. An *ἔριθος* was originally a 'day-labourer,' and *ἐριθεία* was work done by such a man. With such work there is obviously nothing whatever wrong. But such work is inevitably done for pay; it is done with the purpose of making a living. Then there comes into the word a change of accent and of emphasis. *Ἐριθεία* comes to mean work which is done for no other motive than that of pay; it comes to describe the spirit of the workman who has no other interest than the pay he receives for his work. Then the word takes a final downward step. It enters the world of municipal and national politics; and it describes the spirit of the man who is actuated by no other motive than the motive of ambition. He has no conception of the service of the community; he has no idea of contributing to the public good. His one aim in seeking office in whatever society he may happen to be is his own honour, his own prestige, his own prominence and his own gain. *Ἐριθεία* is selfish and factious ambition. Chrysostom has an eloquent passage in his homily on these verses, as he warns men against *ἐριθεία*. 'This, as I always say, is the consequence of all evil. Hence come fightings and contentions. Hence come envyings and strifes. Hence it is that love waxes cold, when we love the praise of men, when we are slaves to the honour that is paid by the many, for it is not possible for a man to be the slave of praise, and to be a true servant of God' (Chrysostom, *Homilies on Philippians*, 5). There are many people whose service in the Church is absolutely selfless; but there are some few whose motive is their prestige; and there are some few in the Church and in every voluntary organization whose motive, if they knew their own hearts, is that the Church and the voluntary organization are for them the only spheres in which it is possible for them to achieve a brief authority. Those who are inspired by *ἐριθεία* are wreckers of Christian fellowship.

(*e*) What the A.V. calls 'vainglory' must be banished from the Christian fellowship. The word is *κενοδοξία*, literally 'empty opinion.' Suidas defines it as 'any vain thinking about oneself.' *Κενοδοξία* is that conceit which is founded on a false view of oneself. There is such a thing as a just and legitimate knowledge of one's own abilities and talents; but *κενοδοξία* is the mental attitude of the man whose whole thinking about himself is wishful thinking, who sees himself through rose-coloured spectacles, who has surrounded himself with a certain romantic glamour. The one safeguard against *κενοδοξία* is an honest comparison of ourselves with Jesus Christ.

(*f*) Now Paul ceases to deal in negatives and comes back to positives again. The Christian must live in 'lowliness of mind.' The word is *ταπεινοφροσύνη*. This is a distinctively Christian word. It is a commonplace to note that in classical Greek there is no word for 'humility' which has not some tinge of that which is mean, ungenerous and low. *Ταπεινοφροσύνη* is what Vincent called 'an outgrowth of the gospel,' and what Trench called 'a birth of the gospel.' In the New Testament the word occurs in other seven passages besides this passage. Once it refers to man's attitude to God and to the attitude of the service which is worship (Ac 20^{19}). Twice it is used of a false and assumed humility (Col $2^{18.\ 23}$). In all other cases it describes the Christian's essential attitude to his fellow-men. That which will always give this word its meaning and its greatness is that *ταπεινός*, its corresponding adjective, is a self-description of Jesus Christ. Jesus said: 'I am meek and lowly in heart' (Mt 11^{29}). *Ταπεινοφροσύνη* describes the disposition in which there is no self-assertion, no self-display, no self-seeking, no wrong pride, no false ambition, nothing which would divide a man from his fellow-men, and nothing which would give him a false valuation of himself.

Ταπεινοφροσύνη is the word in which the essential difference of the Christian ethic is summarized. In Aristotle we have the picture of the best of all characters, the man who is *μεγαλόψυχος*, 'great-souled' (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV. iii. 3–34). Let us look at that picture. The great-souled man is the man who claims much and who

deserves much. Any one who claims less than he deserves is small-souled, especially when his deserts are great. Now, the greatest claim of all is the claim to honour, and it is that claim that the great-souled man makes. Therefore, he must be a good man. When he is set in honour, he feels that he is only receiving that which is due to him. To all other things than honour he will be quite indifferent; therefore, the great-souled man will give the impression of being a haughty man. He will have a certain contempt of other people who are lesser souls; and, being such as he is, he is justified in despising others. He is fond of conferring benefits, but he is ashamed to receive any benefit. He desires always, not to be in any one's debt, but to put others in his debt. He will remember any benefit he has conferred, but will forget any benefit he has received, and will hate to be reminded of it. He will never ask for help, or only with the greatest reluctance. He will never go into any situation or society where any one else has the first place. He will be very outspoken, because he despises other men. He will be incapable of living at the will of any one else. He will lack the quality of admiration, for nothing seems great to him. He will bear no grudge and will never be interested in gossip, because he is entirely uninterested in other people. He likes things which are beautiful and useless rather than things which are useful.

Such, then, is Aristotle's picture of the great-souled man; and it is not far from being the antithesis of ταπεινοφροσύνη. In the presence of God the Christian man will always have the humility of the creature before his Creator; and in the presence of his fellow-men the Christian man will always have the consciousness that he is amongst men as one who serves. 'Humility,' said Chrysostom, 'is the cause of all good. . . . Haughtiness is the first act of ingratitude, for it denies the gift of grace.'

Ταπεινοφροσύνη involves the death of self, and makes it easy for a man to forget himself and to honour and to respect others.

(*g*) Lastly, Paul insists that in Christian unity every man must 'look not on his own things,' but also on the things of others. The Greek verb which the A.V. translates 'to look' is σκοπεῖν, and is stronger than that. It means in this case rather 'to concentrate upon.' So long as each man concentrates intensely upon himself and upon his own interests, there can be no such thing as unity; there can only be a competitive disintegration. It is when a man learns to concentrate as much upon others as upon himself that unity becomes a possibility. In other words, for Christian unity a man must learn to love his neighbour as himself.

So Paul sets before the Philippians the ideal of Christian unity. Christian unity implies a society where men think and act in harmony, a society in which each man lives in unconquerable benevolence to every other man, a society in which men share the very essential life principle which keeps them alive, a society in which there are no selfish ambitions, and no false self-valuations, a society where men live in the sense of their dependence on God, and of their debt and duty to others, a society in which men have learned to concentrate on the interests and the feelings of others as much as on their own.

We must now go on to see the appeal which Paul uses to move men's hearts to desire such a society, and the dynamic he offers to strengthen their wills to attain to it. [*To be continued.*

Literature

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF HISTORY

The title of this slim volume—*The Christian Doctrine of History*, by Professor John McIntyre, D.Litt. (Oliver and Boyd; 12s. 6d. net)—like its contents, will challenge thought. Is there a Christian doctrine of history? There are Christian doctrines of God, of Christ, of Creation, of Man, and of many other things, but are we to add History to the list? Professor McIntyre affirms that we must do so: 'the rootedness of Christianity in history commits the Christian exponent to a quite specific doctrine of history.' He is surely right: the revolution in historical method, which was the great achievement of the nineteenth century, has compelled us to take seriously the historical character of the Christian faith in a way which previous centuries would not have understood. In the twentieth century we are thoroughly history-minded; we speak constantly about 'God's revelation in history,' 'God's acts in history,' 'the fulfilment of history,' '*Heilsgeschichte*,' '*kairos*,' 'the centre of history,' 'linear history,' 'history and eschatology,' and so on, and it is salutary that we should be made to ask ourselves what these *clichés* really mean. The fact that the principal theological discussions of our day are concerned with revelation as historical and eschatological *event* is evidence of the far-reaching consequences of the nineteenth century's discovery of historical method—a discovery which rendered obsolete the traditional conception of revelation. The outstanding

task of Christian theology in the twentieth century is the restatement of the meaning of revelation.

Professor McIntyre's theses fall right in the target-area of contemporary theological and philosophical debate, and his short book will have a stimulating, even exciting, effect especially upon those who have been trying to grapple with the problem of historical revelation for themselves. Its comparatively few pages are crowded with insights and suggestions which cannot be adequately worked out in so short a space ; indeed, it would take a life-time to articulate and evaluate them with the careful consideration which they merit. So compressed is his argument that it is impossible to summarize it ; it is already too highly concentrated for comfortable digestion at one reading. Perhaps we might say that Dr. McIntyre is a ' theologian's theologian ' : he writes in a condensed and economical manner which will be best appreciated by those who have already become aware, albeit dimly and inarticulately, of the problems which he handles with such lucid and confident mastery. He discusses the contemporary development of thought about time and history at its growing points in thinkers like Niebuhr and Butterfield, Bultmann and Cullmann, John Marsh and A. G. Hebert ; but it is his own reflection upon the themes which they have expounded that is the truly valuable element in his book.

Professor McIntyre defines history as meaningful occurrence, and this at once leads us to see that as Christians we must discern a meaning which will not be accessible to historians without faith. The Christian meaning of history is a construct out of certain categories, namely, Necessity, Providence, Incarnation, Freedom and Memory. Each is treated in a helpful and suggestive way ; the present reviewer might perhaps have added Miracle to this list of categories, but he would not wish to omit any of the others. Three chapters are devoted to the category of Incarnation ; and it is argued that the fulfilment of God's revelation to Israel is the clue to the New Testament's understanding of Christ and indeed of Christ's understanding of Himself. This argument is well conceived and presented ; but perhaps the most important contribution of these chapters is the demonstration that the Incarnation is a category of history in the sense that it is not merely an event in history (or ' above ' history, or ' beyond ' history, or anything of the kind) but that it actually *makes* history—' *makes* history what the Christian believes history to be.' A brief final chapter on ' History and Structures ' might well be expanded into a whole book ; perhaps we may be allowed to hope that some day its content will receive the full-scale treatment that it deserves.

The background of Dr. McIntyre's thinking is always Biblical, but are the citations of Ro 8^{22} and Jn 16^{8} on pp. 76 and 83 respectively entirely felicitous ?

ALAN RICHARDSON

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND ESCHATOLOGY

Details apart, Dr. N. Q. Hamilton's argument in this Basel dissertation—*The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul*, ' Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers ' No. 6 (Oliver and Boyd ; 8s. 6d. net.)—seems to me completely convincing. In three chapters he shows that, in Paul's teaching, the Holy Spirit is, first, the Spirit *of Christ*, whose function is to reveal Christ, bind the believer to Christ, and impart Christ's life of resurrection and exaltation ; and, secondly, that the Spirit belongs primarily to the future, as the ' power of the redeemed future . . . released to act in the present ' (p. 26). He also shows how this Christological and eschatological understanding of the Spirit throws light on Christian life in the present. All this is done on the basis of a detailed examination of the relevant texts, which if it does not often throw new light on the Biblical material does conscientiously collect and clearly set forth the most probable interpretations. (One exception is Ro 8^{23}, where the denial that *tou pneumatos* is a genitive of apposition is unconvincing.)

From this point Dr. Hamilton digresses to give in three further chapters an account and criticism of Dr. Schweitzer's ' thorough-going eschatology,' of Dr. Dodd's ' realized eschatology,' and of Dr. Bultmann's ' reinterpretation of eschatology.' Dr. Hamilton's work throughout shows clear marks of the hand of Dr. Cullmann (under whom he worked at Basel), and the reader is therefore not surprised that Dr. Hamilton fails to agree with any of the three authors named. His presentation of their views, however, is scrupulously fair and courteous, and his criticisms, like his constructive work, are on the whole convincing, though there are places where one feels he has not quite got to the bottom of what Dr. Bultmann is saying. Thus (p. 76) the world-view implicit in Biblical eschatology does sometimes infringe upon empirical science ; to put the matter more accurately, the Bible does sometimes express ' extra-scientific ' matters (on which, as Dr. Hamilton rightly says, science has no right to pass judgment) in terms of the now out-dated science of its own day (to which modern thought is under no obligation to listen). Surely there is scope here for the right kind of reinterpretation. Surely also there is much of value in what Dr. Bultmann says about the anthropological aspect of Christianity, even though (and here I should agree with Dr. Hamilton)

it needs to be supplemented on the historical, Christological side.

This will lead us to Dr. Hamilton's concluding chapter. The first two sections of this provide a summary of the argument of the first three chapters, and an excellent account of their implications for a doctrine of the Christian life. Finally, we have three pages on ' Eschatology as a problem.' One can only say that three pages are not enough. This is shown by the fact that, only here in his book, Dr. Hamilton seems facile rather than satisfying. It will not do to argue that eschatology need not be incompatible with modern thinking because Communism too has an eschatology. There is a good deal of difference between a humanist eschatology and Christian eschatology. Again, it does not suffice to say that though the New Testament contains speculation about eschatological chronology it contains also ' a second strain which criticizes the first and replaces it ' (p. 88f.). By what right do we use the word ' replace ' ?

But these criticisms are intended only (*a*) to invite Dr. Hamilton to expand his last few pages into another book, and (*b*) to emphasize the interest and importance of the present book, which demands serious attention from all students of the New Testament.

C. K. Barrett

THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

One of the most important books to appear for many years is the second edition of the British and Foreign Bible Society's text of the *Greek New Testament,* prepared to mark the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Society. The Greek New Testament published by the British and Foreign Bible Society has remained unchanged since 1904 until now. Until 1904 the Society printed what was to all intents and purposes the Elzevir edition, which was based on the work of Erasmus and which was, therefore, based on late and unsatisfactory manuscript evidence. In 1904 to mark its centenary the Society by permission began to publish the text edited by Eberhard Nestle for the *Privilegierte Würtembergische Bibelanstalt* in Stuttgart. The Society continued to publish that text until now.

In the present volume there are not many changes in the text itself. In certain cases the orthography has been changed ; and there have been certain modifications in the text. But the supreme value of this volume is in its revolutionized critical apparatus, which is the work of Professor G. D. Kilpatrick of Queen's College, Oxford. The aim of the new edition is ' to give a selection of the important variant readings including all readings of moment which may be original, those which are characteristic of the main types of text (such as the Western text) and other readings of special interest.' There is no text of the Greek New Testament published in this country which is so up-to-date, and there is none which gives so fully the evidence from the papyri, including even the recently discovered Bodmer papyrus of John.

In the margin of the text the marginal references are printed and it is an additional aid that they are printed, not against the verse, but against the line to which they refer. The Eusebian Canons are also printed in the margin and set out in the Introduction.

There can be no doubt that this volume is a literally indispensable tool. Much as we have valued the Souter text and long as we have used it, this text must take its place for teaching. We are indeed grateful to Dr. Kilpatrick for his selfless and his self-effacing work, for, though he had helpers, the main work has been his.

We have noted that the numeral sign which should be with *a* at the title heading of pp. 523, 699 and 701 is missing.

The book is astonishingly cheap. Bound in art vellum it is 8s. 6d. ; in regrained leather cloth it is 15s. ; and in Persian with yapp edges and leather lined it is 42s.

All British New Testament students and teachers will look with pride at this production of British New Testament scholarship.

William Barclay

STUDIES IN ISAIAH

Professor Sheldon H. Blank, of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, has published some very unusual views on the Book of Isaiah under the title, *Prophetic Faith in Isaiah* (A. and C. Black ; 18s. net). The author describes his aim as an effort to find meaning in parts of the Book of Isaiah and laments that new insights are rare in a field so well cultivated. His studies deal with all parts of the Book, though they do not aim to touch on all the problems raised by it, and do not profess to be an ' Introduction.' The author writes well, and this Jewish exposition of the religious message of the various parts of this great prophetic collection is marked by many profound insights which will give it high value for Christian as well as Jewish readers. Dr. Blank accepts the common critical ascription of the major parts of the Book to different authors and widely different dates, but makes a further and original analysis of parts that have normally been held to reflect the teaching of the eighth century Isaiah.

He distinguishes between the Isaiah of history

and the Isaiah of legend, and holds that all the passages which promise that Jerusalem should be spared belong to the Isaiah of legend. According to Dr. Blank, Isaiah's view of Jerusalem and the Temple was as pessimistic as Micah's, and in the time of Sennacherib's attack he held out no hope of deliverance. Nevertheless, Jerusalem was delivered and Isaiah's predictions were falsified by events. Hence, at a later time, the Isaiah of legend was created and the promises of deliverance were ascribed to him.

In a similar way Is 7 is divided into two parts, with surprising results. The king's unwillingness to ask for a sign is attributed to his piety and faith, and the present form of the chapter is held to be due to the importation of the Isaiah of legend with the Immanuel prophecy. The reviewer must confess that he is not convinced by these original views.

Much of the present book is devoted to studies in Second Isaiah, and Christian readers will turn with especial interest to what is said about the Servant Songs. Dr. Blank claims that Is 53 is more generally misunderstood than any other passage in the Bible. He denies that it is rightly thought to speak of the Suffering Servant, and calls it the Song of the Servant's Proud Destiny. That suffering figures in the chapter cannot be denied, but he holds that it is not vicarious suffering, and that the chapter speaks of a suffering that is past and a glorious destiny that lies in the future. Following the common Jewish view—which has won the adhesion of many Christian scholars—he holds that the Servant here is to be equated simply with Israel, and that the chapter proclaims God's abiding faithfulness to an ancient commitment.

While attention is here drawn only to a few of the new views which may have particular interest for readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, even though they may find them no more convincing than the reviewer does, it is to be emphasized that disagreement is mingled with deep appreciation of much in the volume, and especially in many of the studies that have not been mentioned here. Every reader will learn much from Dr. Blank's deep religious insight, and will welcome the contribution a distinguished Jewish scholar has made to the understanding of a book which belongs to the heritage of both Christian and Jew.

H. H. ROWLEY

THE LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER

The Rev. Stewart Mechie, D.D., Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History in Glasgow University, has written a book on *The Office of Lord High Commissioner* (Saint Andrew Press; 10s. 6d. net). This publication is admirably suited to meet the needs of two classes. There are every May in Edinburgh a considerable number of visitors to Scotland from distant places. They are greatly interested in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and they are impressed with the pageantry which accompanies the coming to the Assembly of the Lord High Commissioner. 'Why is he here?' they ask, 'What are his functions in the Assembly?' On the other hand many devoted members of the National Church scarcely know how those very natural questions should be answered. Dr. Mechie's small book will sufficiently instruct both. With masterly skill he sketches the history of the Office from its somewhat obscure beginnings well-nigh four centuries ago to the present day. There are chapters dealing respectively with the period from the Reformation to the Revolution, from the Revolution to Modern Times and with the Modern Position.

The question of the institution of a Royal Commissioner is, of course, bound up with the larger and vital question of the relations in Scotland between the Crown and the Kirk. One cannot but admire the skill with which the author has said just what is sufficient about the strong conflict between the Church and the Stuart Kings without overloading his main interest with too many details. James VI believed that he was supreme in the Kirk as well as in the State. He attended Assemblies in person, introduced business, took active part in discussions. When he was not personally present he gave his Commissioner instructions how to act. In those days the King's Commissioner was a member of the Assembly. William III, to some extent, was compelled by circumstances to take close interest in the Assembly. He held, as the Stuarts had done, that the Assembly could meet and dissolve only by Royal Command.

Those troublous times passed, and the Sovereign, while still formally summoning and discharging the Assembly and fixing the date of its next meeting, did not attempt to direct the Assembly's proceedings. Since 1929 the Lord High Commissioner merely addresses the Assembly when he presents his Commission, and when he takes farewell of it. He does not sit in the Assembly, of which he is *ex officio*, not a member. Down to the Union of 1929 he did formally declare the date of the next Assembly after consultation with the Moderator. That has now ceased, and he merely says that he will inform the Sovereign that the Assembly has appointed such and such a date. The Lord High Commissioner, in fact, seems to have no authority of any kind in the Assembly. Why then retain the Office? Dr. Mechie points out that apart from its sentimental value and its reminder of the

'battles long ago' between Crown and Kirk and the victory of the Kirk, the Office conceivably might become of great importance. If a Government hostile to the Church came into power, the Lord High Commissioner might assume a real importance as the direct, intimate link between the Sovereign and the Church.

Dr. Mechie in the course of his fascinating brief sketch touches on many points of interest. To quote only one instance. 'While in England opposition to the King (Charles I) came from the Parliament, in Scotland that opposition came from the General Assembly. These two causes were sufficiently at one as against the King to be able to co-operate in the Civil War, while they were sufficiently at cross-purposes for that alliance to break down once the King was beaten.' That is a very illuminating statement.

This little book, enriched by a very interesting Foreword by the Duke of Hamilton, may be warmly commended as a very real contribution to a topic on which light has been too long lacking.

W. D. Niven

HISTORY OF ISRAEL

It is good that there has now been made available in English translation Professor Martin Noth's history of Israel—*The History of Israel*, translated from the second German edition [1954] (A. and C. Black; 42s. net). The book begins with a brief but valuable introduction, in which Noth gives a survey of the land of Palestine and of the situation in it about 1200 B.C.; he uses skilfully the evidence from Ras Shamra and Mari and the Tell el Amarna Letters, as well as the archæological evidence from excavated sites in Palestine, to build up a picture of the prevailing urban, feudal culture in a population which was dominantly Semitic but in which there were clear non-Semitic elements. Thereafter there follow four main sections, dealing with the origins of the twelve tribe confederation, their development in political power, their period of political eclipse under a series of great empires, and, finally, the turbulent days from the Maccabean rising to the revolt of Bar Cochba.

Noth's view, of course, is that the Israelite confederation was realized only after the settlement of the tribes in Palestine; before that period their mutual relationships were, at best, loose and fluid; and each tribe had its own particular pre-history. The process of occupation of the country he pictures as, at first, a peaceful penetration, in which the existing economy of the country was not seriously disturbed, because the population was still very thinly spread. Most of the Canaanite cities remained secure, and the Israelites, passing from the semi-nomadic stage, were fully occupied with the transition to agricultural life. Clashes with the Canaanites occurred, but they were occasional. The Israelite occupation took place from about 1350 to 1100 B.C., but mostly in the thirteenth century. It was part of a wider movement which was neither planned nor uniform; and it was only in the light of later conditions that the conception of a common history of Israel before the occupation developed; and, when this did happen, it was the central Palestinian traditions that dominated the picture.

Such an interpretation of Israel's history in the early period raises the question of the traditions concerning Moses and the covenant at Sinai. With regard to Moses, Noth's approach is very negative. Moses had probably 'no historical connexion with the event which took place at Sinai' and he cannot justifiably be described as the organizer and legislator of Israel. Whatever the exact nature of the event at Sinai was, it was only some clans which witnessed it, and they were later incorporated into Israel.

But the history of Israel, as it is written, contains a self-testimony which makes it unique; the Old Testament not only gives a mass of traditional material concerning Israel's history but also 'utters the decisive word towards an understanding of this history'.

The translation from the German, which has been done by Mr. Stanley Godman, is on the whole well done, but reference must be made to the fact that some astounding errors are made in the quotation of Hebrew words and phrases.

John Mauchline

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

In this country most theological students, though now allowed to treat Latin and Hebrew as optional, are still required to study New Testament Greek. Many prospective teachers also, whose specialist subject is Religious Knowledge, find it included in their prescribed course. Some, too, learn it for the sheer interest of it and for the understanding of the New Testament which it offers. For all these people a very valuable book has just become available. Its title is *New Testament Greek* (S.P.C.K.; 21s. net), and its author, Dr. Eric G. Jay. Dr. Jay has been Lecturer in Theology at King's College, London, and in that capacity has had practical experience of teaching this subject.

The book is described as 'An Introductory Grammar', but in fact it will provide in one single volume of three hundred and fifty pages as much grammar and syntax as at least ninety per cent. of students are ever likely to require. The main

body of the grammar is arranged progressively, so that the student may learn it in small doses, and after each chapter there are provided exercises so that he may have practice in applying his knowledge. In this cumulative way the whole field of grammar and syntax is covered easily stage by stage. Dr. Jay, however, very wisely provides a complete summary of the grammar at the end of the book, where declensions and conjugations are conveniently set out in orderly arrangement for future reference.

Dr. Jay at one or two points advocates the Spartan way. For every one exercise of Greek-into-English sentences he gives two of English-into-Greek, insisting that we never really master a language until we have learned to write it as well as read it. Moreover, though he provides an English-Greek vocabulary, there is no Greek-English one—only a list of Greek words with page references to tell where the meaning can be found. 'It is of no lasting value to the student', writes the author, 'if the vocabularies at the end of a Grammar Book appear to relieve him of the need to look a word up in order to make certain of its meaning and use'. Here, of course, speaks the experienced teacher.

He deliberately chooses all the examples he can, to illustrate grammatical usages, from the Gospel according to St. Mark, since this is often the first text-book the student has to study.

When a second edition is called for—and we can be sure it will be—we may expect a few modifications, when other teachers have tried out the book in practice and made their recommendations. For instance, it would have been wise to enumerate together all the uses of the subjunctive (even if fuller treatment of some of them was offered elsewhere) instead of giving most of them on pp. 212–215, and others on p. 203 and p. 228. Further, the articular infinitive deserves fuller treatment and more comprehensive illustration.

Here, however, we have a fine teaching (and learning) instrument—clearly written, well printed, and comprehensive in scope. We forecast for it a most useful future.

C. L. Mitton

ST. TERESA

With this volume—*The Interior Castle or The Mansions*, by St. Teresa (S.C.M.; 9s. 6d. net)—it may be said that 'A Treasury of Christian Books', published under the general editorship of Dr. Hugh Martin, takes a new line. Hitherto the volumes have been what is more generally known as 'devotional', that is, works of Ascetical Theology, but with *The Interior Castle* the series plunges into Mystical Theology. Is this wise? With a series which seems designed especially for young people it appears to be asking for introspective inquiry as to the type of prayer people have arrived at and how they are praying. This the Saint herself deplores in v.3.

The book is an abridgment and the cuts are sometimes considerable. Many will have not so much as heard whether there be any chapters 10 and 11 to *Mansions* vi. for they have disappeared leaving not a wrack behind. But the abridgment is very well done, and while inevitably some good things are missed out, the essentials are all there and the abridged work is much more readable and more readily understood.

The translation is a Stanbrook one and has some oddities. What will readers make of the suggestion (in iii.2) that some people 'canonize their trials'? My translation (also a Stanbrook one) translates this passage that they 'look upon their sufferings as signs of saintliness', which is at least understandable. The sisters are exhorted to 'compassionate' those in trouble.

I was reading St. John of the Cross when St. Teresa descended on me, and consequently I have had the interesting and chastening experience of reading the two Saints side by side. It is difficult to refute the suggestion which Dom John Chapman once made that despite the fact that they are so often bracketed together, they are irreconcilable. The *casus belli* is, of course, the question of images. Dom John felt that St. Teresa was concerned with the various evidences and concomitants of prayer, rather than with prayer itself, which is the less discernible the purer it is. It is interesting to note that she records (in vi.7) what is to her an inexplicable inability in some who had been raised to incipient union to meditate on the life and passion of our Lord. Did that fact not make her suspect that her compeer, St. John of the Cross, might have been right in saying that all images impeded progress towards true union? It is in this same chapter that she says she has been told that 'it is better to meditate on the Divinity and to flee from corporal images'. But she stoutly asserts that no one will persuade her that this is a good way, although she has been told that she does not understand the question. Dr. Martin omits this latter passage, and it is perhaps as well for the trouble caused by *beginners* trying to eschew images might be considerable. She says of her own 'intellectual vision' of our Lord: 'In short the benefits caused by this favour prove how great and valuable it is'. Later, according to this translation, she records God appearing in the soul 'not by an imaginary vision but by an intellectual one' when entering the Seventh

Mansion. My own translation calls attention to the fact that this appears to conflict with the opening paragraph of the chapter (vii.2) and the translator of my version consequently transposes 'imaginary' and 'intellectual'. But whichever way it is, St. Teresa will have her vision. One wonders whether it was not St. John of the Cross who had told her that she didn't know what she was talking about on the subject of images and visions. What one would give to have heard the conversations of these two on the inner life!

This reader finished the book with a renewed admiration for St. Teresa's character and commonsense, but a little more doubtful of her as a spiritual guide.

DENIS LANT

This is My Philosophy, ed. by Mr. Whit Burnett (Allen and Unwin; 25s. net), could be a most valuable reference book, especially for those who have been denied the advantage of a comprehensive course of philosophical study. This does not mean a suggestion that it is a simple introductory study, for twenty of the foremost philosophers of the day have contributed to the collection, some of them by specially written articles and others by making a personal selection from already published works. They are not all philosophers in the formal sense of the term, but all of them have sought to formulate a definitely philosophical view of the present world situation. The list includes such outstanding names as Bertrand Russell, Lewis Mumford, J. B. S. Haldane, Aldous Huxley, Karl Jaspers, Schweitzer, Sartre, Maritain, Marcel, and last of all but by no means least, Radhakrishnan, Vice-President of India.

They start from many different points of view, but if a guiding principle can be discerned, it might be described as an approach to integration both of the world and of the individual self, an effort to get rid of the prevailing chaos in civilization and thought, to substitute optimism for pessimism, and, in general, hope for despair. The trend is definitely towards religion, and an exposition of Radhakrishnan's saying, 'The world is an abyss of nothingness, if we take away its roots in the Divine.' The relation to the cosmic Spirit is sometimes identity, tending towards mysticism, and sometimes relational pure and simple, but based on a decided conviction of the ultimate unity of the human and the Divine.

In the academic world it is more or less fashionable to speak of interlinear translations of the Greek New Testament with a certain contempt; but that is an example of academic snobbery; and an interlinear translation can be a most valuable tool, especially to the late learner.

There has appeared *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, the Nestle Greek text with a new literal English Translation, by the Rev. A. Marshall, D.Litt. (Bagster; 42s. net).

In his Introduction Dr. Marshall writes most interestingly and helpfully. He has eliminated the *-eth* termination of third person singular verbs as archaic, but he deliberately keeps *thou* and *thee*, and, indeed, deplores the use of *You* as applied to God. He writes most helpfully of special problems and constructions such as particles and their translation, the recitative *hoti*, the non-telic *hina*, the problem of Greek genders, the genitive absolute, the construction of demonstrative adjectives, verbs which repeat their prepositions in the following constructions, the uses of *ou* and *mē*, with particular reference to their use in questions, the genitive of quality and the many uses of the Greek participle.

All that one can say of a literal translation is that it is literal. The A.V. translation is printed on the margin of each page.

There can be no doubt of the usefulness of this book; and it may well be that he who uses it constantly will acquire a far greater knowledge of Greek than he at first realizes that he is acquiring. This book will be a valuable tool for the student who comes to the New Testament lacking the background that a classical education can give him.

The Acts of the Apostles: Text and Commentary, by Abbot Giuseppe Ricciotti, translated by Laurence E. Byrne, C.R.L. (Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee; $8.00), is a full-length and sumptuously produced commentary on the English text of Acts.

The writer is well acquainted with all the relevant literature; his exposition is clear and lucid; his standpoint is on the whole conservative. We may quote as an example of his approach the section on 'The Scope of the Acts'. First, 'The Gospels are the story of those things which Christ did and said, while the Acts are the story of those things which the other Paraclete did and said'. Second, it is the aim of Acts to show that 'there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for there is the same Lord of all'. These two principles give the theological and the historical aim of Acts. The writer then goes on to deal with the suggestion that Acts is in some sense the brief for the defence of Paul at his trial in Rome. This idea he rejects, but agrees that one of the subsidiary aims of Acts is to show that Christianity was an entirely respectable movement and that its missionaries had been treated with every courtesy and fairness by Roman provincial governors. There is a long and important discussion of the meaning of 'speaking with tongues' at Pentecost.

On p. 16 *pruton* should be *prōton*; and on p. 230 *Deissman* should be *Deissmann*.

This is a useful commentary, and a finely produced book, but it is quite certainly not worth the equivalent of $8.00 in this country either to a library or to an individual. Had it been a quarter of the price it could have been more justifiably commended to English readers.

Dr. William D. Geoghegan, of Brunswick, Maine, in his book *Platonism in Recent Religious Thought* (Columbia University Press and Oxford University Press; 32s. net), has given a valuable informative study of the Christian Platonism of W. R. Inge, Paul E. More, A. E. Taylor, W. Temple, and of the Platonic themes in the religious thought of A. N. Whitehead and George Santayana, all of whom are discussed as individual thinkers.

The author believes that Platonism has been profoundly influential in the history of Western religious thought and that various forms of Platonism are being presented to-day as relevant to the problems of contemporary religious thought. His book also aims to show that 'Platonism as a whole is concerned with five major ideas and their relations: God, the Ideal, natural existence, historical existence, and the nature and destiny of man's moral personality.' The work of each philosopher is carefully analysed, the result of which is much more than a résumé or an appraisement. It is a critical examination leading to his own constructive conclusions.

Dr. Geoghegan claims that contemporary Platonism is a mediating type of religious thought acting as 'a spiritual and intellectual bridge between the past and the present.' It is not inevitable that Platonism and Christianity be amalgamated though 'they have important affinities with each other.'

The book can be commended as a worthy contribution to this field of philosophical studies. It contains a comprehensive bibliography, is carefully annotated, and is excellently produced.

The Idealist Tradition: From Berkeley to Blanshard, ed. by Dr. A. C. Ewing (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., and Allen and Unwin; 40s. net), is the first of a new series—The Library of Philosophical Movements—and the title of the series is full of promise, it being exceedingly useful to have the multitude of philosophical books arranged in close connexion with the tenets of the school to which they belong. The most valuable part of the book is the all-too-short introduction contributed by the editor himself. Thereafter the substance of the book consists of selections from the leading idealists, beginning with Berkeley and coming down to the present day, but for each of these selections Dr. Ewing contributes some very helpful notes. For the most part the selections are from the writings of the leading idealists themselves, but Hegel entirely baffles the editor, and he sets forth the main tenets of the Hegelian philosophy by lengthy quotations from Edward Caird and Josiah Royce, much to the benefit of the reader. The selections come down to quite modern times, culminating in Croce and Blanshard. And at the end—lest the idealists should get quite above themselves and be tempted to exclusive idolatry of their central beliefs—the last hundred pages are occupied by pointed criticisms of the idealist faith from such doughty opponents as Cook Wilson, G. E. Moore, Bertrand Russell and Ernest Nagel, who cry aloud and spare not. The most interesting of the controversies is between Nagel, the last of the opponents, and Blanshard, the last of the idealists, over what Nagel considers to be an insufficiently supported attempt of Blanshard to establish the strictly logical character of the world as a whole. Nagel demands more contingency and greater freedom, and both antagonists argue so well that we are left in the grip of bothersome indecision.

For his series of Riddell Memorial Lectures Dr. H. G. Wood thought it appropriate and timely to take the theme *Freedom and Necessity in History*, and the three lectures are now published under that title by the Oxford University Press at 6s. net.

In the first lecture, entitled 'The Nature of Historical Knowledge,' Dr. Wood deals with the tendency to blur the distinction between history and the natural and social sciences, and argues cogently that the historian is dealing with an aspect of human experience which the physicist is compelled to ignore and which cannot be adequately covered even by the generalizations of the psychologist or sociologist. In the other lectures Dr. Wood returns to a subject which has occupied his attention in the past and deals ably and faithfully with the Marxism which treats history as a necessary process and would reduce the historian to a natural scientist. He touches also on another contemporary form of historical inevitability—that which finds that recent advances in technology have placed mankind in tragic predicaments which seem insoluble. As against this Dr. Wood holds that while human freedom is subject to real limitations, the sway of necessity is not absolute and men do have some capacities of choosing between good and evil. The situation which confronts us is not of our choosing; but the situation does not itself dictate our response to it. That depends on our faith and knowledge, and we need not give up in despair.

Science and Religion: Has the Situation Changed?[1]

By Professor John McIntyre, B.D., D.Litt., The University of Edinburgh

Co-existence is the euphemism which we employ nowadays to describe the relation in which two parties in any controversy stand to one another once they have come through the excesses of hot war and cold war to an armed, cagey, and highly suspicious neutrality. Miss Mary Hesse recently defined the relation of science to religion in these terms. The question before us is whether this is a true account of the situation or not, whether, in fact, the attitude of hostility implied by the term 'co-existence' is still representative of the mind of the two camps; whether, finally, there have not taken place changes of so profound a nature in the whole previous field of controversy as to render the term 'co-existence' an anachronism. No excuse need be offered for re-opening the old forgotten matters in the relation of science to religion, for the following reasons:—

(1) The first is that it is always interesting to return to controversies which have shaken previous generations and have ended inconclusively, to discover if advance in knowledge has yielded evidence to settle the matter one way or the other, and if, indeed, the controversy still exercises the minds of thinking people. It is clear that advance in knowledge since the classic form was given to the science and religion controversy in the nineteenth century over the theory of evolution has been greater than in any period of the same length in the history of mankind. There is, therefore, a *prima facie* case for judging that the terms of the controversy have altered, and that some of the old issues may have solved themselves.

(2) The second ground for re-opening the question of science and religion is that in one form or another it constitutes part of the implicit heritage of all tertiary if not also of all secondary education. The crisis in modern education is often quite wrongly presented as a doubt about whether the humanities or technology should provide the basic structure for the curriculum. The real problem is that modern education lacks any clearly defined *telos*, goal, which as Aristotle taught so long ago must constitute the basis of all education. For him that goal was a certain conception of the *good man*. The modern educator, because of his scientific doubts about religion, is not prepared to include religion in the *telos* of his system. We are educating for fractional existence —back-room boys who have to rely on instinct, sentiment, and intuition when called upon for decision in the front room. All the light, guidance, insight which might be expected from religion is denied them there, for they have absorbed all the old scientific suspicions of religion, in the course of their secular education.

Accordingly, whether we are prepared to admit the possibility of apologetics or not as a valid theological discipline, it nevertheless is a fact that problems in the field of science and religion are part of the contemporary mind to which we preach Sunday by Sunday. These problems, therefore, are humanly speaking the anvil upon which many of our contemporaries will hammer out their faith. As such they require our closest attention.

(3) There has of recent years been an interesting group of books published on the question of science and religion, and these have raised matters which some had thought to be quite forgotten and irrelevant. Here are but a few titles: *Christian Theology and Natural Science* by E. L. Mascall; *Science and the Human Imagination* by Mary B. Hesse; *Natural Religion and Christian Theology* by Charles E. Raven; *Natural Science and the Spiritual Life* by John Baillie; which may well be supplemented by a number of books published a few years earlier and still most relevant—*Civilization, Science, and Religion* by A. D. Ritchie, *Christ and the World of Thought* by Daniel Lamont, and *Science, Religion, and the Future* by Charles E. Raven. It is a most interesting feature of the modern theological situation that, at the very time when we are becoming most keenly aware of dogmatic method and subject-matter, there should be taking place also a very penetrating analysis of the cultural

[1] This article is based on lectures given in The University of Aberdeen, 25th February 1958, and at the Summer School of Theology, St. Mary's College, The University of St. Andrews, 2nd July 1958. The second part will appear in the November issue. In discussing in it the relation of science to religion certain changes are mentioned in scientific thought which from the side of theology suggest a new approach to some of the problems which caused so much distress in the old days. In conclusion there is indicated the many ways in which theology and religion have been enriched and corrected as a result of the controversy.—*Editor.*

world to which the Christian message is directed. It is a situation fraught with tremendous possibility if neither side prematurely endeavours to rule the other out of court.

(4) An extra-academic consideration is at the same time compelling us in the direction of the re-examination of the relation of science to religion. It is the widespread but not altogether carefully analysed belief that in some way the dangers that confront modern civilization through the possible misuse of atomic energy are due to the divorce of science from religion. Rightly or wrongly, it is supposed by many people that science cut loose from the sanctions of religion and morality becomes the prey of evil, power-obsessed men, destined by the action of some madman to annihilate the whole world. Obviously there are many logical fallacies in this kind of thinking in addition to quite a few false premises, and much of the language in which the subject is discussed is highly emotive. But we all do enough of this kind of thinking and talking, when we are not perusing *The Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, to suggest that there is some good reason for doing so. If scientists are genuinely concerned about the misuse of atomic power, and if Christians are convinced that their faith relates to the whole of life, we have in these two premises sufficient ground for re-opening the question of the relation of science to religion.

As part of the answer to the question whether this relation has changed in say the last hundred years, I propose to discuss what exactly was involved in the old conflict.

I.

(1) Probably the greatest single cause of the old conflict between science and religion is to be found in the dominant place which Newtonian physics came to have in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Undoubtedly Newton himself did not intend this kind of consequence. In fact, so far was he from believing that the laws which he had defined were in themselves adequate to the preservation and interpretation of the world that he posited an intermittent Divine irruption into the universe to secure its continuance. But the main stream of scientific thinking flowed in a different direction. The extrapolation of Newtonian physics into the field of metaphysics, where the Cartesian dualism of mind and matter, of primary and secondary qualities was already part of the gospel, had two consequences which inevitably led to conflict with religious interpretations of reality. On the one hand the physical scientists affirmed that the Newtonian type of description was the only true account of reality. If the primary qualities governed or described by the Laws of Motion belong to the objectivity of our experience, and if the secondary qualities and the tertiary qualities of the older Gifford Lecturers and even the God of Christianity are subjective additions to reality, then by the very force of the terms, if by no very sound logic, the latter are relegated to the limbo of the illusory or the unreal. On the other hand, this extrapolation of physics into the field of metaphysics has meant that scientific knowledge has been erected into the norm for all knowledge, and the scientific method becomes the only method of establishing truth. The very success of the scientific method within its proper sphere encouraged its supporters to extend it to areas of knowledge to which it was not particularly appropriate.

(2) Two other points of conflict between science and religion may be mentioned, directly connected with Newtonian physics, but important enough to have separate implications. The first is Determinism, a view which affirms that the occurrence of events in the physical world takes place in accordance with definable laws and principles, which would not allow them to occur in any other way or not at all, given their antecedents. For the post-Newtonian physicist, the whole course of Nature could be deduced from a knowledge of original positions and velocities of the individual atoms through the application of the Newtonian laws and similar laws governing electrical and magnetic phenomena. As far as it was an affirmation of the uniformity of Nature there was no question of a conflict with religion, for this affirmation was a secularization of the rationality and Providence of God. The conflict arose when two things happened: first when it became evident to Christian thinkers that the universe presented to them by science was closed, even to God and, secondly, when they realized that determinism stultified God's offer of salvation and His demand to live a life of service to Him. The Christian judgment on determinism will rest finally on the basis not of an anthropology which resents being de-humanised or mechanised, but on the Christian understanding of what God offers us and demands of us in Christ.

(3) The other sequel to the dominance secured by Newtonian physics in the Western scientific tradition is Materialism. When scientific materialism which in itself involved the denial of spiritual values—a denial incidentally which was often betrayed by a very spirited practice of them—combined with economic determinism which called in question the sincerity of all social morality, then it was clear that the conflict of science with religion had penetrated to the very heart of daily living. In fact, the linking of

scientific with economic materialism and the consequent popularizing of it through the ideologies of Communism and Socialism have lent it a longer term of existence than it might have expected in the ordinary course of events. In these fields it has persisted even after its abandonment in that of physical theory, as it has also done in some of the other sciences which have not revised their physical presuppositions to keep pace with theoretical physics.

(4) Perhaps the best known storm centre was the subject of Evolution. Darwin's theory has been stated for us by G. G. Simpson (*Chambers's Encyclopædia*, V. 496) : All groups of organisms vary and many of their variations are hereditary. More young organisms are produced than live to reproduce in their turn. Those that do succeed in reproducing are on the whole those whose variations best fit them for survival in the struggle for life. The offspring do not inherit all the variations of a preceding generation equally, but there is selection in favour of the fitter (more adaptive) variations. Long continued selection of this sort eventually so changes the lineage that it represents a species (or higher unit) different from its ancestry. Three facts facilitated the acceptance of this theory in spite of its unflattering aspects, especially man's ancestry. The first is this that it could be readily illustrated from the experience of everyone who had had anything to do with the rearing of whippets for Powderhall or Ayrshire dairy cattle. Next, the general idea of the survival of the fittest provided a scientific basis for what was already in existence—ruthless economic competition. We should, for example, expect Arnold Bennett's Card to have very little difficulty in accepting this theory. And if Imperialistic expansion could be subsumed under the rubric also, so much the better for it. The third fact assisting the acceptance of the theory of evolution is one which can be elicited from the Preface to the German Edition of 1883 of the Marx-Engels *Communist Manifesto*, in which Engels uses the phrase ' social evolution ' and claims that the *Manifesto* is an economic transcript of Darwinian evolutionism. It was a connexion which was not to be lost sight of in the next fifty years, and it is particularly interesting as a further example of the phenomenon which we have just observed in relation to materialism, namely, that it became earthed through its involvement with economic theory and achieved a popularity and a persistence which it could never have achieved had it remained an academic issue.

(5) Conflict was inevitable between science and religion over the subjectivity-objectivity problem. The objectivity aimed at by the scientist of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries involved the detachment of the investigator, so that his personal prejudices and presuppositions should not be allowed to interfere with either the experimentation or the statement of the results to which he was being led. This kind of objectivity became the norm not only in the physical sciences but also finally in the social sciences, such as history, economics, sociology and even psychology. The late nineteenth century was the period of scientific history, when interpretation was thought to distort historical perspective and to preclude objective, detached and unemotional judgment. The kind of thinking and writing which Christians practised was obviously ' subjective ' on a standard of objectivity of this kind. It followed from quite definite presuppositions ; it demanded the subjective attitude of faith as a pre-condition of *knowledge* of its content. Kierkegaard had written in 1848 that ' truth is subjectivity ', but while his views ironically became popular in Western Europe in a type of existentialism which was a denial of the Christianity expounded by him, nevertheless Kierkegaard affirmed explicitly what was implicitly assumed by many of the supporters of religion in the controversy.

(6) We have already seen how wrong it is to regard the conflict between science and religion as an affair of the schools, and how through its extension into economic theory in evolutionary Marxism and economic determinism it became embedded in popular thought. There is another reason for affirming that the conflict is to be discerned at other than academic levels. It is this, that the conflict in some cases arose from the contradiction by Christianity of some of the basic presuppositions of Western scientific culture and civilization. The conflict was not one between science and religion *simpliciter*, but between religion and that society with all its premises and preconceptions of which science is a function. Two examples will illustrate this point. (i) The myth of the Fall has always been the subject of severe criticism by the scientifically-minded, allegedly on the grounds that the account of the differentiation of the sexes is child-like, that the talking serpent is an impossible phenomenon, the effects of the fruit-eating unparalleled in human history, while the anger and jealousy of God are typical of all primitive religions. Concentration on these eccentricities has proved a most useful evasion of the real truth with which the myth deals : that man is a creature of God in obedience to whose law alone will he find his true happiness ; that he is a being dependent upon God for all things, endowed with powers to conquer Nature, and yet so much a part of Nature that he must draw his sustenance from it and may find himself the subject of Nature in the very act of

conquering it; and that man has sinfully made himself Lord of his own world. The success of the scientific, or more accurately, technological civilization added to the slickness of all of his gadgets appeared to give the lie direct to most of these insights: man was in control of Nature; the inadequacies in his life were but the imperfections which he would remove with the onward march of knowledge and skill. Man who determined the status of all else in the universe by reason of his possession of the scientific method—God, morals, minds, purpose, and so on—had little hesitation in regarding himself as the centre of the universe. (ii) The second main trouble in this present connexion lay in the Christian Doctrine of the Atonement. Here, I should say, what the scientifically-minded man rejected was not so much the fact of Christ dying this death under God's will and out of love for men, but the suggestion inherent in all such talk about atonement, that man was the sort of person who required this to be done for him. The moral complacency and even anæsthesia of the technologically-minded nurtured on the rapid advances in all fields led to the reduction of the thought of the necessity of faith to a minimum, which proved scant equipment for the years in which success brought its own tragedies of war. Then moral complacency found that the other pole within its moral field was a form of cosmic pessimism. Once again we see that the conflict cut more deeply into the life and thinking of ordinary people than do most of the problems of the academic world, this time because the conflict was a conflict of presuppositions between what were rapidly becoming two ways of life. [*To be continued.*

Milestones in Books. I

By the Reverend Principal Norman H. Snaith, D.D., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds[1]

My first book, beyond question, must be *Alice in Wonderland*. 'When we were very young' at home, we had a largish copy, light blue covers with Alice and the tumbling pack of cards on the front cover, and all the Tenniel drawings. I cannot remember a time when we did not have this copy of *Alice*, and my own children have been brought up on it, so much so that if anybody started to quote (even a phrase and by accident), the whole family would join in and were prepared to 'begin at the beginning, and go on till you come to the end: then stop.' What we learned from *Alice*, though not perhaps in those earlier days, is that if you start wrong, with the wrong premises, then the more logical you are afterwards, the farther you go astray. *Alice* has helped me to understand the absolute necessity of a firm belief and faith in God as the starting point. If a man is to know the meaning of a thing, he must know its *telos*, the purpose of it, what it was made for, its place in the scheme of things. No man can deal with facts until he knows the truth about them. One ounce of theory is worth a whole ton of facts. I forget the exact details of the question which G. K. Chesterton (was it?) said it was most important to ask a prospective landlady, but it had something to do with the constitution of the universe. There is a very great deal of sense in that apparently nonsensical statement. It matters a very great deal what we think about the fundamental principles. What is the use of being here at all unless we make up our minds as to why we are here? How can mankind ever do more than wander round in small circles (or large circles, for that matter), unless men can fix their gaze on some distant star? If it is true (which I deny), as some modern thinkers aver, that there is no purpose in things, then it is quite certain that men would have to invent one. 'No wise fish would go anywhere without a porpoise.' Among other things, *Alice* has taught me how important theology is. It is not enough to have 'a religious experience.' A man must have ideas about religion if his experience is not going to be a temporary and an

[1] Educated at the Duke's School, Alnwick and the Manchester Grammar School, where he was School Captain, Norman Snaith left with an open mathematical scholarship to Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In the First World War he was a Technical Assistant in the Internal Ballistics Branch of the Research Department at Woolwich. Whilst at Mansfield College, after two more years at Woolwich, he gained both the Junior and the Senior Kennicott Hebrew (University) Scholarships. There followed in due course an Oxford D.D. and also one from Glasgow University. In 1957 Dr. Snaith was President of the Society for Old Testament Study. This year he is President of the Methodist Conference. He was a circuit minister for eleven years, and since 1936 has been Tutor in Old Testament Languages and Literature at Wesley College, Leeds, where he is now Principal. 'Notwithstanding all this,' a recent account says, 'he is no academic recluse; for he carries his weight of learning almost undetectably. Watch him playing chess, but don't take him on unless you are really good. Ask him about his cacti. Sit with him at Old Trafford or the Oval, at St. James's Park or Stamford Bridge, and you will learn how richly human he is.'—Editor.

amorphous emotion, whether a pleasant cat-like luxury of gratified limb-stretching or a cauldron of froth and bubble that quickly boils away. I am not surprised that so many evangelistic campaigns die away and that after a little while there is little to show for them.

There is another thing that *Alice* has taught me. Whether other people have learned this I do not know, but in *Alice* there is a pleasant detachment from things, as though Lewis Carroll spent a great deal of time sitting on the wall and quietly chuckling as the great world passed by. Lewis Carroll knew that this world is never really real. The dreamland of half real, half unreal, is not down the rabbit-hole : it is here, round about us all the time. The spectacles of the Christian are bifocal, but the long distance sight is very long, away beyond the stars of God, and if sometimes the Christian seems unworldly it is because he, like Alice, is in a dream. But his dream does not have to do with the world beyond : that is real and crystal clear to him. His dream has to do with this world, for this is the world that is comparable to Alice's Wonderland : this is the world where things keep changing and never continue in one stay. It is not exactly that the Christian's home is semi-detached : it is both semi-detached and wholly-attached—semi-detached to the things he has been able to see all along, fully-attached to the Christ he has come to see. He carries his house with him, not on his back, but in his heart. And all the time he can be gay of heart, for he knows that his joy comes from the Lord Himself, and so long as he continues in that state of grace to which the Lord Christ has brought him, that deep abiding joy will never depart. In the deep sense of the words : 'He hasn't got no sorrow, you know,' even though he may 'sob a little now and again.'

My next book is one I bought for myself in the summer of 1909, during my first summer holidays after I had started to learn Greek. My school was what the Mock Turtle would call 'a really good school,' an old Grammar School where we started Latin at nine and Greek (though only two of us) at eleven. It will be a bad day for England when educational standards are levelled by chopping off the head and destroying these old Grammar Schools, but 'that is another story.' The book is the india-paper edition of Nestle's *Greek New Testament*, published by the Württemberg Bible Society. Mine is the second edition of 1899. It cost sixpence, and it is one of the two sixpenny-worths which have benefited me more than all the other money I have ever spent. How I came to have that sixpence that day as I wandered round the old Nottingham market-place I do not know, because my pocket-money was one penny a week, and that was mortgaged, under agreement with my sister, every other week for one of W. T. Stead's *Books for the Bairns*, and the other week was concerned with an elaborate scheme for buying Packer's Chocolate Drops. The book contains six hundred and fifty-six pages of Greek text in the smallest possible compass, and it was out of this little book that I first read my Greek Testament and learned, at one and the same time, to love my New Testament and also to love Greek. The good work of loving Greek was taken over later by a copy of Pindar in the 'Loeb Classical Library.' This was given to me by my father-in-law, at least a year before either he or I ever thought there might be any such relationship. I have often wondered —but *meketi paptaine porsion.*

I must explain that other sixpence. I spent this on a copy of R. J. Campbell's *Life of Christ* in the Benn's 'Sixpenny' series. This was the best sixpenny-worth I ever received. This little booklet began for me what another book many years later completed. One way and another I took in during the 1920's a good dose of Liberalism, and was greatly impressed, as were most of my student generation, by Glover's *Jesus of History*. The net result was doubtless not what Glover intended, but I was much taken with this Jesus who was a human being, the perfect Man, the last term in the series of human progress born out of due time, Elder Brother, everything and anything but the Saviour who died for me, in whom, and in whom alone, I had to trust for salvation. It was R. J. Campbell who taught me differently, and as a salute to R. J. Campbell I have never read more than the first chapter. This is because I did not read more than the first chapter when I first bought it. If you were to write a life of Christ, where would you begin ? Bethlehem ? Nazareth, either before or after ? Prophets ? R. J. Campbell began at Pentecost. That was as far as I have ever got with that book, because when I read that, I put the book down and said, 'Of course, that is where a man ought to begin. If it had not been for Pentecost we would never have known.' That is, indeed, the proper place to begin, because that is where those followers of His were changed into new men and have become convinced of the saving work of Christ, and not only so, but convincing in the way they talked of what Christ had done for them. This little book of R. J. Campbell combined with *Alice* in telling me that a man must have the witness of the Spirit in his own heart, and that he must start from that experience, not finish with it.

And so to the fourth book, which is Anders Nygren's *Agape and Eros*, in Philip Watson's translation. The first part was translated originally by Father Hebert, but I do not think that his

Catholic training enabled him fully to appreciate the cleavage between *agape* and *eros* as defined and used by Anders Nygren. The second part (in two volumes) was translated by Philip Watson, who is now Tutor in Theology at Wesley House, Cambridge, but at that time was Assistant Tutor here at Headingley, Leeds. He has since retranslated the first volume, so that now the English translation can be obtained (S.P.C.K.) all by the one translator. This book has meant more to me even than the Bible, not because it is more important than the Bible, nor because it is truer than the Bible (Heaven forbid !), but because it taught me how to read the Bible. *Agape* stands for love that is absolutely, utterly and completely unselfish, 'seeketh not its own.' It is a word invented by the Greek translators of the Hebrew Bible, and used by John and Paul to describe the unique love of God for men. It is essentially a Christian word standing for something that is essentially Christian. It was this love, none other and nothing less, that brought the Lord Jesus into this world to die upon the Cross. It is a love that does not depend upon any worth at all in the object of it ; it is God's love showered freely upon all men, and to be realised by every man who turns to God in repentance and faith. Its contrast is *eros*, which Nygren uses to mean 'self-love,' that innate self-interest which is born in us, the root of all sin. Nygren is very much against any compromise which would combine *agape* and *eros* into any sort of synthesis, such as the *Amor Dei* of the Catholic tradition. It was this sharp distinction between the natural *agape* of God and the natural *eros* of man which finally brought me right over from the human Jesus of my earlier years. This book taught me that all hopes for man or for the world built on *philia* (brotherly love : 'give and take') are doomed to disaster. This is why all hopes of world brotherhood and all agnostic ideals, however splendid, are doomed from the start. They do not deal with *eros*, and until this self-love of man is dealt with, and man is transformed into a 'new man in Christ Jesus,' there is no hope either for him or for the world.

No student of the Old Testament could ever give a list of books that did not include those four volumes of Sir George Adam Smith in 'The Expositor's Bible,' the two volumes on *Isaiah* and the two volumes on *The Twelve Prophets*, all of which have been re-issued in recent years. I wonder how many sermons have been preached out of these four volumes ! And I wonder how many preachers have taken from them rather more material for a sermon than is seemly ! George Adam Smith had a method of writing which is of inestimable value. He was a fine and exact scholar, and yet no one could read anything he wrote without being inspired. T. K. Cheyne was like that in all his earlier work, before he was enchained by his Jerachmeel and other obsessions. There is ch. 4 in the first volume, which deals with 'Isaiah's Call and Consecration,' and there are chs. 5 and 6 in the second volume which deal with 'Isaiah 40.' His exegesis of Is $40^{30f.}$ is perhaps faulty, but what he says is nevertheless true to Christian experience. Nowadays we treat 40^{31} as two couplets : 'they shall exchange strength (*i.e.* have God's strength instead of their own human strength) and shall grow wings like the eagle-vulture' : 'they shall run and not be weary, they shall keep on travelling and never faint.' Thus there is no anti-climax ; but for all that, George Adam Smith wrote many a word on that verse which has helped thousands. I do not think I shall ever forget his description of Tekoa in the volume which deals with Amos, especially since this led me on to his magnificent *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, a book which still has its value in spite of the superb Grollenberg *Atlas of the Bible*.

And last of all, there is the Hebrew Old Testament. I do not believe a man can understand the New Testament unless he knows his Old Testament, and I am certain he cannot really understand his Old Testament unless he knows some Hebrew. Certainly for me, since I have learned some Hebrew, I have found a new world more splendid than ever Cortes saw from the peak in Darien. Water is not the only thing that is best.

Recent Foreign Theology

New Theological Journal. The first part of a new Theological Quarterly, published in Prague, and containing articles in English, French, and German, has appeared.[1] It bears the title *Communio Viatorum* — Communion of Wayfarers, and it should serve to keep scholars elsewhere informed as to what is happening in the theological world in Czechoslovakia. This issue contains eight articles and book reviews. One of the articles is a richly documented study on the resurrection of the dead, by Pavlinec, while an article by Souček traces through the Bible the motif of sojourning or

[1] *Communio Viatorum*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Published by the Ecumenical Institute of the Comenius Theological Faculty, Prague, and obtainable from Jungmannova 9, Praha 2, Czechoslovakia ; $3 per annum.

wandering. A shorter study by Segert, on Ex 20^5—'to the third and fourth generation'—is dedicated to Professor Eissfeldt on his seventieth birthday. An article which will have a wide interest is J. L. Hromádka's on 'The Crisis of the Ecumenical Fellowship.' This will be most instructive to those who would study the situation of the Church under Communism. The author sees a petrification and hardening in the ecumenical situation since Amsterdam, when, he says, Christians behind the Iron Curtain were regarded as outposts of Western Christianity, and no one realized that the predominance of Western Christian civilization was at an end. He does not clamour for the abolition of nuclear weapons, but says they have prevented the outbreak of a new world conflagration. Yet the cold war has exceeded any previous method of hostile action in its effect upon world morale. The author disclaims any intention to pass judgment on any, save that he thinks the whole Church stands under condemnation. That there is a subtle political bias against the West pervading the article will offend no Western reader, who will reflect that under a communist régime nothing else is possible. Read with sympathy and understanding it will be found to have moving interest.

Genesis 1–11. Professor F. Michaeli has written a small book on the opening chapters of the Bible, consisting of a brief commentary on Gn 1–11, preceded by an Introduction.[1] The commentary is simple, and suitable for wide circulation. The introduction might with advantage have been fuller and clearer. After indicating the normal critical view of the compilation of the Pentateuch in a few lines, the author says that this theory has been subjected to a profound revision, and tells his readers that research on oral tradition has made it imprudent to analyse the accounts for literary reasons. This is much too simple. That many of the ritual practices of the Priestly Code are much older than the compilation of the Code has long been recognized, but the study of the pre-exilic history makes it difficult to suppose that the whole existed in oral tradition throughout that period. Moreover, when dealing with the Flood, Professor Michaeli distinguishes a priestly tradition from other elements of the story. But this is equally to analyse the narratives for literary reasons, and nothing is gained by calling them strands of oral tradition instead of strands of written tradition. Their diversity is in no way harmonized in this way.

In the commentary part of the book there are many excellent things. The tree of life in the Garden of Eden is not regarded as an alien intrusion into the story, but is accepted as integral to it. Its fruit was not forbidden to man so long as he obeyed God, but disobedience entailed his removal from it and therefore ensured death.

[1] *Le livre de la Genèse : Chap. 1–11* [1957]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris ; French Fr. 300.

The Old Testament and the Church. The same author, Professor Michaeli, has written another small book in the same collection, designed to be translated and circulated in Africa, dealing with the Old Testament and the Christian Church to-day.[2] This is simply written, and it should certainly be useful to French and English general readers, though how far it will find African readers in large numbers able to appreciate its arguments the reviewer could not estimate. The author insists on a fundamental unity of the Bible, yet at the same time on a difference between the Old Testament and the New. He presents the Bible less as a text book of history than as the history of salvation, and argues that God took Israel at the point they had reached and revealed Himself and His will to them in the terms of the stage where they were. The Old Testament looks towards the New and the New back to the Old, so that each is necessary to the full understanding of the other. While all is put simply all is well put, and the author is a scholar who forsakes the paraphernalia of scholarship in order to present its finds in a readily assimilable form.

Perhaps the paragraphs on polygamy should be looked at again before the work is put into African hands. What the author is seeking to say is that Old Testament polygamy belongs not to the content of the Divine revelation, but to the society to which the revelation was given. What some of his African readers may say is that polygamy belongs similarly to the African society to which the gospel is given, and just as Hebrew polygamy was not swept away in swift enactment but gradually superseded and outgrown, so African polygamy should be dealt with. The author emphasizes that the milieu and customs of Israel were not those of modern European Christians and must not be imitated by the latter. But if they are in this matter comparable with those of African society it may not seem obvious that they are improper for African Christians. This is a very difficult and complex subject, which deserves much fuller study than it can have in this book.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

[2] *L'Ancien Testament et l'Église Chrétienne d'aujourd'hui* [1957]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris ; French Fr. 300.

The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John

By the Reverend Ivor Buse, University College of North Wales, Bangor

The differences between the Johannine narrative of the Cleansing of the Temple by Jesus and the account in the Synoptic Gospels constitute a well-known problem.

The most striking divergence is that, whereas the Synoptic writers place the occurrence during the last days of Jesus, John puts it as early as the second chapter of his work. That Jesus should have driven the traders out of the Temple on two different occasions is most unlikely, and thus we are forced to ask which, if either, of our records is correct. The majority of scholars[1] prefer the Markan dating: for they feel that it was this final challenge that provoked the authorities to put Jesus to death. They usually regard the Johannine dating as due to dogmatic motives, but Bernard hazarded the suggestion that the passage was an example of 'dislocation' in the text of the Fourth Gospel.[2] Some scholars, however, feel that the Fourth Gospel is more likely to be right.[3] They remind us that Mark tells of only one visit to Jerusalem and that, as a result, he presents us with a week that is over-crowded with happenings, many of which must actually have taken place at a different period.[4] He has to date the Cleansing of the Temple during this much too busy week: for Jesus was in Jerusalem at no other time in his narrative. Yet a third possibility has been suggested: that the difference between Mark and John indicates that the happening had no fixed chronological place in the tradition and that it might have occurred at a time different from that indicated by either of the Gospels.

The Johannine and the Synoptic accounts differ also in their content. John alone mentions the whip of cords, the sheep and the oxen. Whereas in Mark Jesus overturns the seats of the dove sellers as well as the tables of the moneychangers, in the Fourth Gospel He gives the dove-merchants what is apparently preferential treatment.[5] In Mark He attacks the trade as making the place of prayer a den of thieves, while in John He condemns it as turning the Temple into a shop.

These differences are so great that a number of writers use them as an argument that the writer of the Fourth Gospel shows no knowledge of the Synoptics. Thus Gardner-Smith[6] says that 'the cumulative effect of these contrasts is enough to throw considerable doubt on the assumption that John must have had the account of one or more of our Synoptic Gospels in mind,' and R. H. Strachan[7] remarks in agreement that 'the place here given to the Cleansing by the Evangelist hardly suggests that he was acquainted with the Synoptic Gospels.'

The matter is complicated, however, by the fact that there are also striking agreements between John and Mark,[8] including even the κολλυβιστής condemned by Phrynicus. Thus τοὺς πωλοῦντας . . . περιστεράς and τοῖς τὰς περιστερὰς πωλοῦσιν are paralleled by τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστερὰς, ἐξέβαλεν by ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν, and καθημένους seems to look back to something like Mark's καθέδρας. In both John and Mark the Jews ask for proof of the authority of Jesus. The one has τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς; and the other ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς. Moreover, as Hoskyns so pertinently remarked, even the material which is to be found only in the Fourth Gospel at this point can be found in the Synoptic tradition in widely different contexts.

It can hardly be said that those who deny that John knew the Synoptic Gospels offer satisfactory explanations of these agreements. Gardner-Smith[9] dismisses them with the question, 'Are they so numerous and so close as to demand a theory of literary dependence?' and goes on to observe that 'wherever the story was told there must have been mention of "sellers," "tables," "money-changers," and "doves": for it could hardly be related at all without the use of these words': but it is extremely doubtful whether he allows full weight to the extent and closeness of the

[1] *E.g.*, E. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, 198 ff.; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 163 f.; R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel*, 112.

[2] *The Gospel according to St. John*, I. xxx. 88 f.

[3] *E.g.*, P. M.-J. Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon Saint Jean*, 65.

[4] *E.g.*, V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 462.

[5] Lagrange, *op. cit.*, 66.

[6] *St. John and the Synoptics*, 14–15.

[7] *The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment*, 125.

[8] Cf. Hoskyns, *op. cit.*, 71 f. and 197 f.; Barrett, *op. cit.*, 162 ff.

[9] *Loc. cit.*

correspondences. R. H. Strachan [1] remarks that 'any verbal agreements are quite consistent with the hypothesis that the Evangelist is making use of a tradition of his own, which included some verbal parallels'—which is merely to put the problem a stage further back. Bultmann [2] wants to eliminate the whole of *v.* 15 in John as a secondary supplement from Mk 11^{15} or Mt 21^{12}. He argues in support of this that the Synoptic κολλυβισται takes the place of the κερματισταί of *v.* 14 and that the saying of Jesus is addressed not only to the dove sellers but to every one. To use such textual surgery in defence of a hypothesis, however, is only to make it suspect.

We thus reach apparent deadlock. If we say that John knew one or more of the Synoptic Gospels, we find difficulty in explaining the difference between his account and theirs. If we say that he was ignorant of them, we find it hard to account for the similarities. There seems no hope of advancing toward a solution of the problem by further analysis of John. The only possibility that remains open to us is to examine the Markan account more closely. Many scholars have felt that the way in which Jesus is challenged about His authority in Mk $11^{27f.}$ implies indignation about the recent Cleansing of the Temple and that 'these things' is difficult to understand except as a reference to that act. The words of Vincent Taylor [3] may be quoted: 'It is possible that ταῦτα refers to the Cleansing, and, in this case, from the first the narrative reflected a rudimentary biographical interest; it told how Jesus answered a challenge arising out of His action in the Temple. This is probably the better view, for it is unlikely that the question put was purely general.' If this is so, the connexion between the two incidents is obscured in St. Mark by Mark's handling of his souces of information. Readers may remember that A. T. Cadoux argued that Mark was combining two sources at this point, his Palestinian Gospel or A in 11^{15-19} and $^{27-33}$, and his Gospel of the Dispersion or B in *vv.* 13–14 and 20–25.[4] W. E. Bundy has recently given a more convincing account of Mark's narrative in his study of the Synoptic records [5]: 'The challenge to Jesus' authority should follow immediately on the cleansing of the temple. The two incidents are now separated by secondary matter (*vv.* 18–21) and displaced sayings (*vv.* 22–26). Verse 27a, "And they come again to Jerusalem," belongs to the artificial day-by-day division when morning returns to the city. If *vv.* 18–27a be deleted, then the Cleansing and the challenge come on the day of the arrival in Jerusalem and on the first visit to the temple. As Mark's story now stands, the challenge in *v.* 28 is isolated: the reference to "these things," something definite and recent, has no antecedent. But if *vv.* 27b and 17 are joined, this challenge becomes a natural reaction to the cleansing and the demonstrative "these" is clear.' If this analysis is sound —as it seems to be—we find to our surprise that the Fourth Gospel is more in accord with Mark's source for these stories than is the Gospel of Mark itself. This seems to imply that the Fourth Gospel writer is dependent for his account of these two incidents not on the Gospel of Mark but on one of its sources. Presumably the source was a written one. The extent and nature of the verbal agreements point in this direction, and, as Bultmann [6] has observed, Jn 2^{21} seems to be a comment on a statement already in writing rather than on purely oral tradition.

The Synoptic Gospels themselves present a problem in the two narratives concerned: for there are present a large number of agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. Both the later Synoptic writers make the Cleansing take place immediately on the arrival of our Lord at Jerusalem. Neither records the refusal of Jesus to allow the carrying of vessels through the Temple. The two agree in the surprising omission of 'for all the nations' from the words of Jesus. They both introduce the Old Testament quotation in the form of a statement, while Mark makes Jesus ask a question. In Matthew and Luke the words are an utterance on the occasion of the Cleansing: in Mark they may well be a summary of the content of more continuous teaching. When we turn to the story of the inquiry about the authority of Jesus, we find that, whereas Mark introduces the incident by remarking that Jesus was 'walking' in the Temple, Matthew and Luke say that He was teaching. Neither has ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς or ἀποκρίθητέ. Both have ἀποκριθεὶς . . . κἀγὼ and οἱ δὲ. In their parallels to Mark's *v.* 32 they agree in using ἐὰν δὲ. It is obvious that the explanations of the 'minor agreements' between Matthew and Luke offered, for example, by Streeter are totally inadequate here. It is most unlikely that Matthew and Luke would quite independently make so many identical alterations in the story they found in Mark. We are forced to agree with the judgment of Stanton [7] that these agreements indicate either the use of something

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] *Das Johannesevangelium*, 87, note 1.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 468–469; see also Taylor's comment in note on text, pp. 469–470, with the list of scholars who hold this viewpoint.

[4] *The Sources of the Second Gospel*, 111, 118, 134, 172 ff., etc.

[5] *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 453.

[6] *Op. cit.*, 85–86.

[7] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, 216.

like an Ur-Markus or the influence on Matthew and Luke of some other document.

Thus the problem of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in these stories seems to link up with the problem of the relationship between the Johannine and the Marcan accounts. It may be significant that the Fourth Gospel shows some slight agreement with the two later Synoptics. In the Fourth Gospel, too, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem, enters the Temple and, seeing the situation, acts at once. His utterance is made on the actual occasion. Nothing is said about the carrying of vessels. A source known to Mark and John could be known to Matthew and Luke. If it was sufficiently authoritative or familiar, they would naturally revert to it on occasion when it disagreed with Mark. The explanation of the most complicated series of facts seems to be that both John and Mark were dependent upon an earlier account of the Temple Cleansing and that the influence of this earlier account led Matthew and Luke to make the same corrections in the Marcan story. The fact that John dates the occurrence so differently from the Synoptics seems to lead to the conclusion that a smaller source than an Ur-Markus is involved.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

'I Wish I Were. . . .'

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content.'—Ph 4^{11} (R.V.).

We have all met the boy who wishes he was someone else. 'I wish I lived in the country,' he says when he hears about a long day spent on the river in a kayak. 'I wish I lived in the city,' he says when he reads about a model railway exhibition in London. One day it is: 'I wish I could swim like Judy Grinham,' and the next it is: 'I wish I could bowl like Laker.'

Presently when exams come round, it will be: 'I wish I had a clever father, like Bingo Burton in 2A'—as though that would make any difference to the results! Later he will change his tune. 'I wish we had an M.G. Sports, like the people up the street.' And one day we shall hear him complain, 'I wish I knew the managing director, so that I could get a job in that firm.'

But there he is. He lives in a small town where nothing much happens. He isn't much good at swimming or cricket, though he just scrapes into the form team on the wing at football. He hovers between the bottom of the A and the top of the B form, and he'll probably have to get a job by his own efforts.

Suppose the Apostle Paul had been an 'I wish I were -er'. Suppose he had said: 'I wish I had gone on with my studies in Law. I should have made a great name for myself by now. I wish I had stayed in Palestine instead of scouring half the Greek world: it would have saved me the shipwreck, the floggings, and the illness I have suffered all along. I wish I had been able to stun the cultured Athenians by my message, for then I could have stayed there all my life, enjoying the chance of preaching to people who really appreciated my words.'

Instead of wishing, he left himself totally in the hands of his Master. For Him he was prepared to be roasted by the Eastern sun, cursed by the ignorant pagans, and reviled by the enemy Jews. He would go anywhere Christ sent him. He would endure his 'thorn in the flesh,' the disloyalty of his friends and the foolishness of his churches.

When he wrote the words of our text, where do you think he was? He was in a foul Roman prison somewhere, shivering with cold and wondering when (if ever) he would be free to move on God's errands again. But he was content: that was his word. Like Bunyan's Shepherd's Boy, whose song we sometimes sing as a hymn, he knew that 'He that is down needs fear no fall.'

> I am content with what I have,
> Little be it or much;
> . . . . . .
> Fullness to such a burden is,
> That go on pilgrimage.

Here is a story told by Booker T. Washington, the great negro educator. A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a vessel. She ran up the signal: 'Water, water: we die of thirst.' At once the other vessel replied: 'Cast down your bucket where you are.' The men on the distressed ship thought the others were laughing at them. Again they signalled: 'Water, water: send us water.' Again the reply came: 'Cast down your bucket where you are.' Three times this happened and then the captain almost in desperation let down his bucket. It came up full of fresh, sparkling water which allayed their thirst. They had drifted into the wide mouth of the great Amazon River.

The man who follows Jesus knows that God has set him in the midst of great opportunities wherever

he is. Tall or short, black or white, brainy or beefy, girl or boy, rich or poor—God's great service provides us all with the chance to live to the full and to find our supreme satisfaction in doing the job we can in the place where we are. 'Cast down your bucket where you are.'

When I was a small boy, I remember, a preacher came to our church and quoted a verse of Charles Kingsley's. It ran like this :

> Do the work that's nearest,
> Though it's dull at whiles ;
> Helping, when we meet them,
> Lame dogs over stiles.

I didn't understand it then, because there were no lame dogs in our street and we were miles from a stile. And now I am grown up and a teacher, I should give Kingsley only about four out of ten for those particular lines of his poetry. But his religion is worth almost full marks.

Prayers God doesn't Answer

By the Reverend John R. Gray, V.R.D., B.D., Glasgow

'Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do.'—Jn 14^{13}.

The other day I heard a story about a little girl who was being very naughty. It seems that the people, who live next door to her, very often take her with them on a picnic. On this particular day, however, she hadn't been asked. As soon as she saw the preparations for the picnic being made she started to cry, and cried solidly all through breakfast. After a while the kind neighbours actually heard her. Taking pity, they came in and said she might come. As soon as she heard that, she cried all the louder. At this, her mother quite lost patience with her. 'You cried when you weren't going on the picnic,' she said, 'and now you cry because you are. What *is* the matter with you ?' To which, through her tears, the little girl replied. 'It's too late for them to ask me now. I've prayed for rain.' Well, of course, fortunately for her God wouldn't hear that prayer, or, rather, wouldn't answer it. He never does answer us when we ask for bad things for people. Indeed, He only gives us the sort of things which we can ask for in the name of Christ, the sort of things which Christ Himself loves to give. That's why Christ said, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask *in my name*, that will I do.'

The Christian Year

Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity

A New Look at an Old Story

By the Reverend W. B. J. Martin, Augustine-Bristo Congregational Church, Edinburgh

'There was a certain rich man, which had a steward ; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. . . . And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely : for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.'—Lk 16^{1-8}.

It is generally agreed that this is a very difficult parable. On the face of it, it seems as if Jesus is commending, if not actually approving, the trickery and fraud of a dishonest servant. Even when we point out, as we must, that it is the Lord of the Manor, not the Lord Jesus Christ, who does the commending in the story, the fact that Jesus told the story at all seems to indicate that He saw something in this rascal's attitude worthy of attention from His own disciples. The Christian moral sense is offended by the thought that such a crafty character can be a model for Christian action, so some commentators have preferred to ignore the dubious morality and to concentrate on the resourcefulness and prompt decision displayed by an otherwise unsatisfactory character. But, when we find added to the story a comment, by Jesus Himself, 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness,' the mystery deepens. We all realize that it is perfectly possible to do this ; people are doing it every day ! But it is difficult to believe that Jesus actually commended it. Either this comment is out of place here, or it means something other than appears on the surface. Much ingenuity has been expended on this story by commentators in all ages, but the greater part of it seems more an attempt to explain it away than to explain it.

T. E. Hulme, the philosopher-artist, once said, 'The covers of a book are responsible for much error.' When a man's thought is bound between hard-covers, it assumes a finality which it does not really possess. It gives the subject of his book a neat and tidy shape which is not always true to life. In much the same way, one might say, the *title* of a book is responsible for much error, for the title often acts as a clue to the interpretation of what is within, and if the title is badly chosen, it may lead the reader astray.

The New Testament itself does not give titles to any of the parables, but this story under review has traditionally come to be known as 'The Parable of the Unjust Steward.' I wonder how much influence that has had on the interpretation of the

story ? Is it the parable of the Unjust Steward ? Is he, indeed, the chief actor within it ? Is this what the story is *about*—the crafty wiliness of a dishonest servant ? As long as we think so, the story is bound to present difficulties to thought and the moral sense. But suppose we ignore the traditional, and perfectly gratuitous, title ? Does not the story take on a new look, yield a more intelligible meaning, if it is given some such title as 'The Parable of the Unusual Master' ? Is not that what the story is really about ? And immediately we interpret the parable from this standpoint, it begins to yield a new crop of meanings, meanings which are much more in accord with the thought of Jesus Christ.

On any showing, the Rich Man in this parable was a most unusual character. His behaviour, by all worldly standards, was extraordinary. Defrauded by a worthless employee, he was actually magnanimous enough to praise him, not to blame him ! He was so objective in his judgment that in spite of loss to his own pocket, he was able to see the fellow's astuteness and to comment favourably upon it. We are told that he was rich, and the implication seems to be that he had accumulated his own wealth by shady means. But most human masters, however tricky they are themselves, bitterly resent being imposed upon and tricked by others. In fact, the more a man lives by outsmarting and defrauding the public, the more apt he is to be enraged when he is outsmarted in turn, especially by one of his own workers. There is some ground here, then, for treating the story as ironic, and not as a transcript from life.

The fact that this imaginary character was able to praise some one who had cheated him, points to two things. First, that he was so fabulously rich that he did not feel the effect of the fraud perpetrated upon him, there was plenty more where that came from ! Secondly, that he was so extraordinarily magnanimous that he quite understood that the poor devil of a steward was entitled to work on his own account as well as on his master's. His carelessness about conventional standards, commercial and personal, irresistibly calls to mind another employer from Jesus' repertory of Rich Men—the employer who rewarded his eleventh-hour labourers at the same rate as those who had borne the heat and burden of the long day. He, too, acted most unusually, and most unwisely, from a prudential and business-like point of view. His action would hardly have met with the approval of the Palestinian Employers' Federation ! And was it not an encouragement to slackness and unpunctuality ?

Is it not possible to think about the Rich Man as God ? It is God who sends His rain upon the just and the unjust with undiscriminating liberality, God who shines upon the evil and the good alike. If we read the parable with this in mind, does it not drive home the evangelical fact that in the sight of God every man is an unjust steward, and can never be anything else ? 'We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God.' Is not this the point of the parable—the amazing forbearance and understanding and generosity of God towards those who, whatever they do, are always defrauding Him, always cheating Him of His rightful due ? What Jesus is saying in this story is addressed to men who are defrauding God every day of their lives ; He is deflating the pretentiousness of those who pride themselves on their 'righteousness.' He is saying, 'Stop filling your mouths with talk of what is righteous and unrighteous, and be content to say, " God be merciful to me a sinner ".'

It was Georg Groddeck, the Viennese psychologist, speaking as a psychologist and not as a Biblical scholar, who first turned my mind to the possibility of this interpretation. Is he not right in saying, 'The Pharisee teaches a man to be honest with others so that he may receive what is his own. But nothing is his own ! All belongs to God. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Since you are men and must serve mammon, don't prattle about the way you serve God ! No man can serve God. What service can be rendered to Him ? What men think lofty, God looks upon as an outrage. The Law and the prophets came to an end in John the Baptist. Now you have the Glad Tidings that man is, and is permitted to be, man ; that he no longer need strain his natural powers nor seek to add an ell to his stature, but need only be that which he is, a man' (*The World of Man*, 259). Behind these words of the practising psychologist one hears the echo of the dominical words, 'When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants : we have done that which was our duty to do.' But to the psychologist's insistence that we must confess our flawed humanity, we must add an equally emphatic insistence on God's grace. We only become men, men without strain, when we accept our new status in Christ and open our lives to the richness of that Master of the Estate who is willing to treat us with a depth of mercy and understanding unknown in the natural world. No interpretation of this, or any other parable, is valid which simply urges men to work harder or use more human wisdom. Jesus did not come to exhort men, or to proffer good advice, but to proclaim the Good News, which concerns above all the nature and character of the God with whom we have to do.

Having established that the parable is a gospel

parable, *i.e.* concerned with the amazing grace of the Owner of the world, it is then possible to look at the secondary figure of the unjust steward, and see ourselves in him. Like him, many of us think we can evade the final accounting of life by making ourselves comfortable here and now, by being generous with what is not our own, by buying temporary security at no cost to ourselves. We are apt to interpret the words, 'Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy' as if they meant 'Blessed are the easy-going for they too shall be let off.' Not all the comments appended to this parable necessarily belong to it, they may have been introduced from another context, but the words 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness' are quite understandable if we take note of the words that follow them. If a man's motive in handling life is 'to be received into everlasting habitations,' *i.e.* so to live and work and spend that he realizes his destiny as a son of God, not in order to side-step it, then he will use the 'mammon' of this world to grow in grace and to develop his capacity for fellowship with God. There are two ways of facing everyday life—one that makes an ally of life, one that makes an enemy of it. By our attitude to things some of us become our own greatest enemies; the more we accumulate, the smaller we become; by concentrating on hoarding and keeping we isolate ourselves from our fellow-men, set up barriers, lose the capacity for growth. But we may so handle the goods of life as to expand in the process, so as to achieve the richest possible personal relationships, and thus to achieve fellowship with God.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

These Little Ones

BY THE REVEREND R. T. HALLIDAY, B.D., ST. ANDREWS

'And Jesus said unto his disciples, It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come: but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble.'—Lk $17^{1,2}$ (R.V.).

'These little ones.' Until quite recently I had always assumed that in the Gospels 'little ones' meant *children*. For in St. Matthew's Gospel this saying follows the incident where our Lord took a child and told His disciples (who were quarrelling about which of them was the greatest) that without the guileless trustfulness of a child none of them would ever enter the kingdom of heaven. St. Matthew, however, was wrong in connecting with this incident the saying about the millstone and causing these little ones to stumble: for St. Mark and St. Luke both show that the phrase 'these little ones' does not refer to children. It is a phrase which well repays closer study.

The phrase occurs half-a-dozen times in the Gospels, apparently in four distinct sayings, and *always* as a saying of our Lord Himself. It does not occur, so to speak, outside the inverted commas of our Lord's own direct speech. What we seem to have here, then, is one of those characteristic phrases which our Lord used, and which here and there have become fixed in the tradition of the Church. Another such phrase, possibly, is the Aramaic word Abba, Father, which our Lord apparently said in so distinctive a way that both St. Paul and St. Mark, writing in Greek a generation later, kept the original Aramaic word He used and simply added the Greek translation. Here, then, in our text we have our Lord's deep concern for the well-being of those whom He called 'these little ones.' Who were they?

They were the little ones of the earth, as opposed to the great ones. They were the ordinary, numberless, nameless folk who believed in Him and trusted Him. They were that great crowd of individuals who just didn't matter, 'the multitude,' lorded over by the earth's great ones. It is hard for us, living in a country where every person possesses a considerable measure of social security, to imagine the cleavage in first century Palestine between the handful of the very rich and the great mass of ordinary people. It is difficult for us, who live in a civilization that has been shaped by nineteen centuries of Christian tradition, to recapture any idea of how little the man-in-the-street mattered in those days. The interests and aspirations, the way of life, the very existence, of the ordinary individual were things of no account. The multitude was just part of the scenery, placed in the world for the convenience of those who held power, of those who mattered. The multitude was an indivisible heap of lower humanity: no one thought of them as individuals—except one Man, one strange Man in Palestine, to whom they were 'these little ones,' a title almost embarrassing in its intimacy and tenderness. How He loved them: and at what a cost to Himself.

'It would be better for a man if a millstone were hung round his neck and he were cast into the sea, than that he should cause one of these little ones to sin.' 'It is not the will of my Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish.' 'Whoever gives to one of these little ones even a cup of cold water because he is a disciple, truly, I

say to you, he shall not lose his reward.' 'See that you do not despise one of these little ones; for I tell you that in heaven their angels always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven.'

Here was something new in the history of the world. The multitude matters! Each individual person is precious in the sight of God who loves him. This new thing was preached by the Church as part of the gospel, and it is small wonder that it was to the little ones of the earth that the gospel made its appeal most effectively. The letters and books of both Christians and pagans in the second century testify to the contempt in which the Church was held for embracing these little ones. 'We see in private houses,' scoffed the pagan philosopher Celsus, 'workers in wool and leather, washer-men, and persons of the most uneducated and rustic kind.'[1] The prominence of women in the Early Church provoked some particularly sarcastic sallies. Yes, the Church was the place where the under-privileged found a home and a hope and a Saviour; the place where 'the multitude' became 'these little ones.'

And then a very significant thing happened. The Church began to be persecuted: not just despised, but persecuted. At first Christianity had been laughed at. Then when it proved a nuisance its leaders were liquidated, and the decapitated body of the Church was left to die. But it did not die. It lived and it grew. New leaders arose and were disposed of, and still this pernicious foolishness spread, until amusement changed to alarm, scorn to fury, mockery to persecution. Who were the martyrs? They were Conon, an agricultural labourer; Julius, a retired private of the army; they were trades-people and small business-men, slaves and freedmen, shopkeepers, housewives, lawyers, civil servants; the vast majority of them nameless, the vast majority of them ordinary men and women like you and me, the little ones of Christ against the glory and might of the Roman Empire that had decreed their extinction.

Who brought the gospel to Italy? It reached there before Paul did: he wrote to the Church at Rome to prepare them for his coming. Who took Christianity to Egypt, Abyssinia, Arabia? Who were the Christians who founded the churches in Mesopotamia, whence it spread to the eastern shores of Asia? What are the names of the Christians who preached Christ on the shores of the Black Sea? The Church faced these questions many centuries ago, and answered them by dividing up the world into regions and allocating them to the known Apostles and Saints—India to St. Thomas, Egypt to St. Mark, and so on. But the truth is, their names are not known. There were too many of them, and their names were not important enough for history to remember them. They were just 'these little ones,' whose names are known only to their Lord, whose names are written, not in our history books, but in the Book of Life. These little ones: these were the missionaries who carried the gospel to the ends of the earth: these were the martyrs who bore the fury of the world. They were outlawed and hunted, thrashed, outraged, crucified, burned, impaled, thrown to the beasts. They were killed, and their Lord came for them, and they knew it and died gladly. They were betrayed, and they fled to the catacombs, the hills, the desert, and continued to worship there. They were hounded out of their home-towns, and they scattered over the face of the earth, taking the gospel with them—to Gibraltar, Scotland, Abyssinia, Russia, India, and China. Scatter the Christians, and you spread the gospel. Kill them in public, and you convert the spectators. Drive them underground, and you lose count of the converts. These little ones counted for nothing and meant nothing, yet they changed the course of history.

So we, who to-day are and to-morrow may not be, whose names will be lost for ever within a generation; we who so often feel that we are insignificant, and that what we do or don't do just doesn't matter; we may look back and look up, and have communion with those who with us are 'these little ones' and who without us will not be made perfect. And you and I may know that we whom history ignores are precious beyond words to Him who is the Lord of history, so precious that all we do and don't do matters, so precious that he who gives to one of us even a glass of water because we are disciples shall not lose his reward, so precious that it would be better for a man if a millstone were hung round his neck and he were cast into the sea, than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble.

[1] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii. 55 (tr. John Foster).

Remembrance Sunday

Silence—and a Voice

By the Reverend Stuart W. McWilliam, M.A., S.T.M., Aberdeen

'There was silence, and I heard a voice.'—Job 4^{16}.

Silence, and then a voice! How characteristic this is of the supreme moments in spiritual history. In the beginning 'the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was over the deep.' A brooding, mysterious, unfathomable silence reigned. And, then, I heard a voice: 'let there be light.' And the world was bathed in radiant splendour, out of the womb of night day was born, for God had spoken.

We see Elijah cowering upon the summit of Mount Horeb. The earth trembles, shivers to its very foundations and then the storm strikes in all its ungovernable fury. There comes fire raving and roaring with insensate rage. And then silence!—a silence in which it seems as if the great heart of the earth had ceased to beat. A silence! And I heard a voice, the voice of God.

On Calvary the day drags slowly on. The spectacle is over. The Figure on the central cross has not stirred or spoken for some hours. But all is not yet over. Suddenly the sky darkens, fear clutches at the hearts of the watchers. There is silence over all, silence dread and impenetrable, and then a voice rings out strong and clear through the stillness. The voice of the Son of God in a great shout of victory. 'It is finished.'

In the passage from Job, from which our text is taken, Eliphaz vividly describes a spiritual experience. One night as he lay awake during the dark watches suddenly fear came upon him, there was something with him in the darkness, a presence he could not distinguish with his eyes, a power that filled him with awe. He lay there trembling, and there was silence, just nothing, but a silence pregnant with a kind of fearful expectancy, an almost unendurable tension, and then he says, 'I heard a voice.' The voice of God.

I well remember that as a schoolboy the two minutes silence on Armistice Day seemed to me one of the most impressive and awe inspiring of experiences. There would be all the normal ordinary sounds of life, people's voices, the rumble of the traffic, the sound of a distant train, and then suddenly a gun from Edinburgh Castle, and silence, deathly silence, silence which seemed almost to last an eternity, and then a voice reading out the names of the fallen.

What voice spoke to us in the silence this morning?

1. *It was the Voice of the Past, the Voice of Memory.* Memory, bitter-sweet with regret and pride, of the men and women we knew and loved. There are some who would say that it is better not to remember. We do not want to have old wounds reopened, and the pain of old sorrows renewed. Yes, it makes us sad, but is it not right that we should be sad! Must we always be so concerned with our own shallow peace of mind that nothing is allowed to disturb it. The man or woman who is afraid to look back is running away from life and is guilty of trying to spare himself or herself at too great a cost, the cost of forgetting the sacrifice of others. It makes us sad, this voice from the past, but surely it also makes us proud, proud that we have known and loved these men and women.

And it should remind us of our debt of gratitude to God. The God to whom we so often turned in our times of trouble, the God to whom as a nation we poured forth our requests at the time of Dunkirk, the God whom, since then, we have so often ignored, the God by whose providence and mercy we escaped the edge of the sword and in our weakness were made strong. There was silence and I heard a voice, a voice from the past, the voice of memory.

2. *It was the Voice of Sacrifice.* It spoke of men who were in love with life. Yet they died. They died in the mud of Flanders, on the beaches of Gallipoli and Normandy, on the banks of the Sangro and the Rhine, in the Burmese jungle and in the African desert—on land, on sea and in the air. And why? Because they felt that it was necessary, that something was at stake, something worth giving the most they had. This does not mean that all these men had a clear conception of the political aims of the War. Most of them were very vague about political theories, but they were clear on this, that the enemy had to be defeated if the ultimate decencies of life were to be preserved. And they hoped that out of this awful holocaust of blood and tears something finer would come for all mankind. We are enjoying the fruits of their sacrifice. This is no exaggeration, it is plain sober fact and it should come home to us with renewed emphasis this morning. It is well that we should be reminded of the sacrifice of others and should ask ourselves how we are using the gifts that were purchased at such a costly price in suffering and death. Are we making it clear that the sacrifice was not in vain, that it was not wasted? Only we can give the answer and we are giving the answer every day in our lives.

3. *It was the Voice of Duty.* We have a duty to those who died and that duty is not fulfilled when we have reverently observed two minutes silence. Go down to Erskine and see the poor wrecks of humanity there but do not think that by a contribution to the Erskine Fund you have fulfilled your duty. No, our duty can only be fulfilled when we have dedicated our lives to the service of others. If a pilot, killed in the Battle of Britain, were to enter the House of Commons would he not wonder with a kind of angry wonder how all that back there should have resulted in just this? And as he listened to the arguments and the counter arguments and the bitter invective and watched the juggling for power, would he not feel that it must be some terrible nightmare? And outside, moving about among the men and women at their work and in their homes, would he feel any better, would he see less selfishness and more consideration, less prejudice and more tolerance, less hatred and more love, less greed and more co-operation? And if he were a sincere Christian,

what would he feel about the progress we are making in the Church of Christ ?

These men and women died for what they believed to be right. If we are not to betray them most shamefully then our clear duty is to live for what we believe to be right, to be as courageous in defending the truth as they were in dying for it. We must strive for and pray for brotherhood, co-operation, unity and love between man and man and nation and nation. This is our duty, and those who have already become cynical and who have decided that it is every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, are both cowards and traitors.

There was silence and I heard a voice, a voice which spoke of sacrifice and duty, but was that all we heard ? Memory, sacrifice, duty, they are wondrous things but what if memory is all we can ever have of our loved ones, then may it not become a refined form of torture, what if sacrifice has no ultimate value, what if duty is but an end in itself ? There was silence and I heard a voice, it was the voice of God, the voice which shatters the silence of death. The voice which promises that our memories are not vain, our sacrifices never without meaning, our obedience to duty not without reward. I heard a voice, the voice which wakens the dead, the voice which bids the trumpets sound the last post only to bid them sound the reveille. I heard a voice ' The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, there shall no torment touch them, they are at peace.'

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Ministry of Intercession

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, D.D., EDINBURGH

' Ye also helping together by prayer for us.'—2 Co 1^{11}.

In this passage St. Paul is obviously referring to his recent deliverance from a situation of gravest peril, peril so dire that he can only describe it in terms like these ' we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life.' In Phillips' translation the phrase ' coming to the end of our tether ' is used—this—from the man who three chapters later is to write ' We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed ; we are perplexed, but not in despair.' Clearly the crisis has been most grave, and out of the glowing sense of relief at what he regards as nothing short of a miraculous deliverance, he thanks the Christians in Corinth for the part they played and the contribution they made—their share in the miracle, as it were : ' You also helping together by prayer for us.' Thus dramatically, and in the kind of situation where men turn instinctively to prayer, do we find exemplified the nature and the value of the ministry of intercession.

Now, over against that ancient instance from the early days of Christianity, when the Church was first exercising the ministry of healing, and discovering the amazing power of prayer, set a modern parallel. Some six years ago, one Sunday morning a Scottish minister was rung up by a distracted father, saying that his little boy, aged seven, had been taken to hospital with an acute attack of polio, and was not expected to live out the day. Would the minister ask the congregation to pray for him ? The minister set the situation before the congregation, and prayer was offered, there and then, specifically and by name, for that child. Some eighty boys from a preparatory school attended that Church, and that night every one of those boys, in his school dormitory, prayed for the child. The next day at the meeting of the Wolf Cub Pack, of which he was a member, he was prayed for again. The child, strangely, and against all medical expectation, did not die. He lay for months in the iron lung, and then gradually was taken out of it for increasing periods, and all this time he was surrounded by constant, untiring intercession. For eighteen months those schoolboys went on praying for him. To-day he is still handicapped, but very much alive, joining gallantly in games, going to school like the rest. Nothing will persuade that child's parents that the ministry of intercession had nothing to do with it. They insist that he was prayed back to life. Of course all sorts of questions arise. Why does John, prayed for, live and in some measure recover, while Andrew, equally loved and prayed for, just dies ? The only answer is that we do not know. Yet from these two instances we can learn this lesson. The ministry of intercession, whether in the first century or the twentieth, whether the prayers offered seem to be ' answered ' or ' unanswered ' always produces three results.

It deepens and enriches the lives of those who pray for others. Often it deepens their sense of gratitude and appreciation for their own lot. As they enter imaginatively, prayerfully, and with a caring heart into the danger, the pain, the sorrow, of those for whom they pray, they learn in a new way to count their own blessings. As the parents who had been in Church that morning heard their own children pray that night for ' John ' they looked with new eyes on the normal, healthy, happy lives of their own children, and were made better people. As those school-boys prayed for one, only a little younger, who might well die or

never walk again, they prayed with new thankfulness to

> God who created me
> Nimble and light of limb,
> In three elements free,
> To run, to ride, to swim.

Always when people pray in this fashion their sympathy is deepened, it is not dissipated in vague generalizations, an indefinite 'feeling sorry' for the many who are less fortunate, but is directed to a specific person, where personal knowledge is obtainable, and some kind of personal contact can be maintained. Deepened and enlarged sympathy is a wonderful by-product of the ministry of intercession. So is the sense that can come to the person praying of rendering a real service, making a definite and positive contribution to the changing and saving of the situation. Surely there is a wonderful opportunity here of mobilizing much spiritual energy, meantime being wasted, like the harnessing of the power of a mighty waterfall to drive the turbines and produce light and power. How many there are, in every church, who feel themselves useless, cut off, unwanted and unneeded, because the days of their active service and usefulness are over, by reason of age, infirmity or altered circumstances. There are always vacancies under the Ministry of Intercession. Let them pray, directly and specifically and regularly, perhaps for the particular work in which they once played an active part, or for particular people, by name and with an imaginative understanding of their need. They will lose their sense of uselessness, and be deepened and enriched.

The ministry of intercession always brings blessing, whatever its results, to those who know they are being prayed for. This truth can be illustrated, simply and directly, by the universal experience of all who have heard themselves prayed for in public. However often it may happen, before addressing a meeting or speaking at any gathering, it remains a moving experience. Winifred Holtby, the novelist, came back from the Dedication Service of a girlhood friend who was going out to the mission field, and wrote in her diary: 'It must be wonderful to decide about the age of twelve to do something obviously worth while, to go and train for it, and then to have about six hundred people gather with you to pray over you and say that you are right.' She might have added: 'And then to go out to a distant land and do what you have chosen, knowing yourself to be all the time supported by the unfailing prayers of so many.' It is truly wonderful how the ministry of intercession reaches out over the sundering miles, bridges every gulf, penetrates behind every barrier, to bring this blessing. Nor does it happen only to 'religious' people, doing 'spiritual' work like missionaries. How many still remember with gratitude and wonder the tryst of remembering and prayer kept at some prearranged time between one on service far from home, amid dangers that could be neither known nor imagined, and those who 'kept the home fires burning' on the altar of intercession. Or, to revert to the previous instance, how immeasurably the parents of the boy with polio were comforted, strengthened and upheld by the wealth of intercession by which they knew themselves and their son to be constantly surrounded.

The ministry of intercession, whether or not God seems to grant the prayer, always unlocks extra possibilities in the situation. The connexion between praying and new possibilities is quite unmistakable. Beyond all question things happen when we pray that would not happen if we did not. There has never been any 'successful' effort in evangelism, any 'real' revival of religion, all the way from John the Baptist, through the Wesleys to Moody and Sankey and Billy Graham, that has not been connected with people praying, exercising the ministry of intercession. 'More things are wrought by prayer' not least intercessory prayer 'than this world dreams of.' Again we do not clearly know why or how; we can only reverently and gratefully accept the fact. Any lay observer, privileged to watch a big operation from the gallery of a surgical theatre, must be impressed by two things—the amazing teamwork that makes it all possible, and the supremely important function of the theatre sister. She seems to read the mind of the surgeon, not only to follow but to anticipate his every move, so that he does not even need to ask; he simply holds out his hand and she puts the right instrument into it. The ministry of intercession is of just that nature; when we truly pray for others, it is as if we put into the hand of God an added instrument for the working out of His saving purpose.

Entre Nous

Man of God and Man of the People

There is no doubt a sense in which 'one man in his time plays many parts,' but in point of fact most people live within fairly narrow limits. It is something to meet a man who was interested in the arts, a great reader of poetry, very know ledgeable on painting, a provocative writer on the

method and the meaning of tragedy, with a competent appreciation of music, a voracious reader of history and biography, a master of metaphysics, with understanding of the principles and aims of natural science, a lecturer equally at home with Plato, Browning or Christian theology, a successful diocesan bishop, a first-class chairman, and 'a very good listener with a ready laugh which put most people at their ease,' an energetic Church reformer, with a sensitive interest in and understanding of ordinary people. Such a man was William Temple. Canon A. E. Baker has collected certain essays and addresses of William Temple, under the title *Religious Experience* (James Clarke ; 21s. net.).

The titles of these essays and addresses show the width and the grasp of William Temple's mind ; they were more than well worth rescuing from oblivion ; but Canon Baker has added infinitely to the value and the worth of this book by his sympathetic and penetrating study of William Temple himself.

It was Temple's achievement that, as the journalists put it, 'He put Christianity on the map.' As Dr. Matthews expressed it : 'He spread a comprehension of the meaning of Christianity among persons who were bewildered by the conflicting voices of our time.' What manner of man was this William Temple ?

He was a man of sturdy commonsense. 'He believed that when a decision had to be taken one should say one's prayers putting before God all the aspects of the matter so far as one understood them, and then, with all the commonsense and insight at one's command, one should make up one's mind and act on it ; and never waste time afterwards in vain regrets.'

No man had a greater social consciousness. 'Temple took for granted that Christianity is concerned, not only with the salvation of individuals, but also with the transformation of the social order.' He himself said : 'If anyone feels that the language which the Church asks him to use is exaggerated—" We do earnestly repent and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings ; the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable "—then let him think of slums and sweating and prostitution and war, and ask if the remembrance of these is not grievous, and if the burden of them ought not to be intolerable.'

He was of all men most tolerant. He wrote a Preface for a pamphlet on pacifism for no other reason than that in it the writer had contradicted him ! At his enthronement in York he said : 'We shall strive for the truth as we see it, but shall never suppose that there is no truth but what we have seen. . . . In all controversy our aim will be to appreciate and incorporate in our own theory or action all that we can find good or wise in the views of our opponents.' He called on men to lay all partisanship aside and to become 'partisans of good will.'

Not unnaturally he was an apostle of real unity between the churches. In this matter he had three principles. (1) There are divisions within the Church, but these divisions do not effect separation from the Church. He insisted that when he prayed for 'the Church' he was praying for every conceivable branch of the Church. (2) 'Faith and order are not equally essential.' He did not believe that there was any one necessary order. He never, for instance, believed that any man had the *power* to make any rite sacramental ; all he had was the *authority* to administer the sacraments which belong to his Church. (3) In any meetings concerned with unity he believed that those taking part should be more eager to appropriate what was of value in the position of others than to justify their own. He never believed in wielding 'an olive-branch as though it were a shillelagh.'

The most characteristic thing about William Temple was his passionate belief in the Incarnation. For him 'the central fundamental affirmation of the Christian religion is that Jesus of Nazareth is the unique, final manifestation of God.' In 'The Preacher's Theme To-day' he wrote :

'"There cannot be a God of love," men say, "because, if there were, and He looked upon this world, His heart would break."

'The Church points to the Cross, and says, "His heart does break."

'"It is God who has made the world," men say ; "It is He who is responsible, and it is He who should bear the load."

'The Church points to the Cross, and says, "He does bear it".'

William Temple, being dead, yet speaks. We are grateful to Canon Baker for collecting these essays and addresses ; we are still more grateful to him that in his loving Preface he has made William Temple live again.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.